

A
HISTORY
OF
THE SĀMSKRĀTA LITERATURE



ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY



12338

891-209
V 42 H

BY
V. VARADACHARI, M. A.

**A
HISTORY
OF
THE SĀṢKṚTA LITERATURE**

BY
V. VARADACHARI, M.A., DIP. IN FRENCH & GERMAN.
Lecturer in Sanskrit
Loyola College, Madras

ALLAHABAD
RAM NARAIN LAL

Bookseller and Publisher

1952

[Price Rs. 5]



CAT

[Handwritten signature]

ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY



12338

CHECKED

[Handwritten mark]

[Handwritten signature]

JAMMU & KASHMIR UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY

No 12.33.8.

Date 2.6.55

SRINAGAR

[Large handwritten signature]

891.209
V 42 H

PREFACE

In the following pages, an attempt is made to give, in brief, an account of the History of the *Samskrta* Literature. This book is mainly intended to give the information needed on this subject to the college students. Most of the existing books on the subject give information about the literature up to the 13th or 14th Century A. D. The Vedic period, the classical *Samskrta* period, the dramas and the *Sāstra* are treated in separate books. A book which treats compactly with all these topics was not written till now. This work supplies this want by giving a brief survey of the entire field of the literature from the Vedic period up to the last century. In a small book like this, it is not possible to give anything like a detailed treatment of the various topics included in this subject. Due attention is however paid to the important topics like the authorship of the *Ramayana*, date of Kālidāsa, date of Daṇḍin, Bhasa's authorship of the Trivandrum plays and others in the best manner possible. In certain topics like Music, *Jyotiṣa Dharmaśāstra* and the systems of thought, mere names of writers are given together with their important works.

Certain changes are introduced in the manner of the treatment of this subject. The *Rāmāyana* receives treatment before the *Mahābhārata*. The works written in the *Kāvya* style, like the historical poems, are brought under Chapter 13. The works written in verse form are treated in the next chapters. Chapter 16 concerns with Anthology which deserves treatment under a separate chapter, since it deals with the verses taken from the *Kāvyas*. The next two chapters are devoted to prose and *Campu* which are distinct types of compositions. Chapters 19 and 20 treat with the Popular Tale and Didactic Fable which are in the form of prose and verse. History is dealt with in chapter 24, after the dramas, as the works on matters of historical interest are in the form of the *Kāvyas*, prose and drama. The systems of *Vedānta* and the religious schools are brought in chapter 35 since all these are theistic in outlook and treatment.

Short comings are bound to be noticed in a work on a subject like this. The chronological difficulties are indeed hard to be overcome. There are also certain pet theories started by

the Western critics which have been having a good following in India even to this day. The treatment given to them in this book deserves the kind consideration at the hands of the critics. It is hoped that the book would meet the demand of the readers.

V. VARADACHARI.

CONTENTS

Preface.

PAGE

i—ii

I. Introductory 1—8

Samskr̥ta—Vedic and classical periods—
spoken and literary language—Prākṛta
and its varieties—writing in ancient
India—peculiar features of the Indian
literature—contribution of the Western
critics to the study of the Indian litera-
ture.

II. The Vedas 9—10

Classification of the Vedic texts—system
of their study.

*III. The Vedas as understood by the critics of
the West* 11—16

Similar features in the Vedas and in the
Zend Avesta—home of the Vedas—com-
position of the Vedas—interpretation
of the Vedas—Vedic civilization.

IV. A criticism of the view of the Western critics 17—21

Traditional view of the Vedas—views
about the authorship of the Vedas—
commentators—equipments of the
Vedic commentator—home of the
Vedas.

*V. The Samhitā, Brāhmaṇa and Aranyaka
portions of the Vedas* 22—26

The various recensions of the four
Vedas.

VI. The Upaniṣad 27—30

The main and minor texts—their classi-
fication.

VII. The Vedāṅgas 31—35

The six supplements—Sikṣā, Vyākaraṇa,
Chandas, Nirukta, Jyotiṣa and Kalpa—

	PAGE.
texts of the various recensions—Vedic indexes.	
VIII. <i>The Epics—The Rāmāyaṇa</i> ...	36—48
Features of the epic literature, authorship of the Rāmāyaṇa—Date—popularity—commentaries.	
IX. <i>The Mahābhārata</i> ...	49—57
Three stages in the development of the epic—Jaya, Bhārata and Mahābhārata—date—critical estimate—Harivamśa—Upākhyānas — Commentators—Rāmāyaṇa and Mahabharata as epics.	
X. <i>The Purāṇas</i> ...	58—63
Definition of a ‘Purāṇa’—importance of the Purāṇas—classification and authorship—brief account—Upapurāṇas.	
XI. <i>The Kāvya period—Pre-Kālidāsa period</i>	64—65
Features of a mahākāvya—Vālmiki, Pāṇini, Vararuci and Pingala were Kālidāsa’s predecessors.	
XII. <i>The Kāvya Literature—Kālidāsa</i> ...	66—72
Date of Kālidāsa—his works, Raghuvamśa and Kumārasambhava.	
XIII. <i>The Kāvya Literature—Post-Kālidāsa Period</i> ...	73—90
Aśvaghoṣa—Max Muller’s Theory of Renaissance—Bhāravi, Māgha, Sṛīharṣa and other poets—features of the Kāvya during this period.	
XIV. <i>The Lyrics</i> ...	91—100
Features of the lyric—two types—erotic and religious.	
XV. <i>The Gnostic and Didactic Poetry</i> ...	101—105
General features—origin and development—anyāpadeśa type	
XVI. <i>Anthology</i> ...	106—108

	Value of anthologies—Gāthāsaptasatī and other texts.	
XVII.	<i>Prose</i> ...	109—117
	Definition—features—two types, Kathā and Akhyāyikā—origin—Bāṇa, Daṇḍin, Subandhu and other writers.	
XVIII.	<i>Campu</i> ...	118—120
	Features—origin and development.	
XIX.	<i>Popular Tale</i> ...	121—125
	(Origin Brhaṭkathā and other tales.	
XX.	<i>Didactic Fables</i> ...	126—129
	General features—Pancatantra and Hitopadeśa.	
XXI.	<i>The Samskr̥ta Drama—origin, characteristics and types</i> ...	130—139
	Traditional view about the origin of the drama—beginnings of drama—early productions—Greek origin for the Samskr̥ta drama discussed—characteristic features—types of rūpaka—uparūpaka.	
XXII.	<i>The Dramas—Pre-Kālidāsan and Kālidāsan Periods</i> ...	140—150
	The Trivandrum plays and their authorship—plays of Bhāsa—dramas of Kālidāsa—Kālidāsa as a writer.	
XXIII.	<i>Post-Kālidāsan Dramatists</i> ...	151—171
	Authorship of the Mṛcchakatika—Viśākhadatta, Harṣa, Bhāṭṭanārāyaṇa, Bhavabhūti and other dramatists—allegorical plays—Chāyānāṭaka—decline of the Samskr̥ta drama.	
XXIV.	<i>History</i> ...	172—175
	Paucity of works on history—Harṣacarita, Rājataranginī and other works.	
XXV.	<i>Theories of Poetry and Drama</i> ...	176—188
	Sāhitya, Alankāra—theories of rīti, rasa, alankāra, dhvani, vakrokti, guṇa,	

anumāna and aucitya—types of rīti, Vaidarbhī, Gaudī, Pāncālī and others—number of rasas—śānta as a sentiment—doctrine of dhvani—aims of writing poetry.

- XXVI. *The Scientific Literature—The characteristic Features and Grammar* ... 189—197
 The branch of 'Sāstra'—characteristic features—system of Grammar—Pāṇini, Patanjali and others—doctrine of sphoṭa—schools of grammar other than Pāṇini's—grammar of Prākṛta.
- XXVII. *Prosody and Lexicography* ... 198—200
 Prosody—vṛtta and jāti—Lexicography—on homonyms and synonyms.
- XXVIII. *Jyautiṣa* ... 201—205
 Jyautiṣa—astronomy, astrology, mathematics, palmistry—Greek and Indian astronomy.
- XXIX. *Dharmaśāstra* ... 206—208
 Dharma—its scope—law-books—digests on law.
- XXX. *The Upavedas—Āyurveda, Gāndharva-veda, Dhanu veda and Arthaśāstra* 209—218
 Āyurveda—Caraka, Suśruta, Vāgbhata and others—medical treatises on the diseases of animals, trees and others—Kāmaśāstra—Gāndharvaveda, dancing and music,—Arthaśāstra; Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka and others—Dhanurveda—Ancillary sciences—Silpa, painting, Ratnaśāstra, stealing, Botany, Chemistry.
- XXXI. *Indian Philosophy and Religion. General Principles and Systems of Thought* ... 219—221
 Philosophy and Religion—their relationship—general features—classification

of the systems into nāstika and āstika groups.

XXXII. *The Nāstika Systems* ... 222—229

The Cārvāka school—Buddhism ; cardinal doctrines. four schools, Vaibhāṣikas, Sautrāntikas, Yogācāras, and Māihyamikas, Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna—Jainism ; Ratnatraya, Svādvāda, two schools Svetāmbara and Digambara.

XXXIII. *The Āstika Systems—Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya and Yoga* ... 230—237

The six systems—Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta—The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems ; pramāṇa, atomic theory—Sāṅkhya, satkāryavāda—yoga ; aṣṭāṅgas, Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga.

XXXIV. *Āstika Systems—Mīmāṃsā* ... 238—241

Special features of the system—schools of Kumārila, Prabhākara and Murāri-miśra.

XXXV. *The Āstika Systems and Religious Systems* ... 242—258

Vedānta ; basic texts—Upaniṣad, Brahma-sūtras, and Bhagavadgītā ; Āgamas,—Dvaita—Advaita—Viśiṣṭādvaita—Suddhādvaita—Nimbārka—Bhāskara—Yādevaprakāśa—Caitanya—Sivādvaita—The Religious Schools of Saivism—Pāśupata, Śaiva, Kashmirian Saivism and Śāktaism—History of Philosophy.

XXXVI. *Conclusion* ... 259—262

Appendix ... 263—268

Index ... 269—302

E R R A T A

Page.	Line.	Incorrect.	Correct.
2	10	<i>bāhās</i>	<i>bhāṣā</i>
4	33	Chrishtian	Christian
5	6	he trise	the rise
10	32	phenotic	phonetic
15	31	sraaddhā	śraddhā
17	23	superme	Supreme
21	6	attritute	attribute
22	13	<i>maṇḍalas</i>	<i>maṇḍala</i>
23	8	<i>Taithiriyasamhitā</i>	<i>Taittirīyasamhitā</i>
	28	affected	effected
24	35	<i>Kāṇ a</i>	<i>Kāṇva</i>
	42	<i>Tāṇḍyāybrahmana</i>	<i>Tāṇḍyabrāhmana</i>
31	12	<i>Nāruktā</i>	<i>Nirukta</i>
	14	their	their study
	17	They	It
	18	contain	contains
32	4	derived	denied
	17	applicables	applicable
33	10	<i>gārhapotya</i>	<i>gārhapatya</i>
	33	be used	to be used
34	37	<i>Kalpa ūtras</i>	<i>Kalpasūtras</i>
	39	<i>Viniyoga angraha</i>	<i>Viniyogasangraha</i>
	41	<i>Gṛhya ṅgrahapariśiṣṭa</i>	<i>Gṛhyasangrahapariśiṣṭa</i>
	43	<i>citta ūtras</i>	<i>cittasūtras</i>
	44	<i>Praysgas</i>	<i>Prayogas</i>
35	5	ब्रणं	ब्राणं
	7	<i>Paṇinīyaśik ā</i>	<i>Pāṇinīyaśikṣā</i>
	17	<i>Rgvidhā a</i>	<i>Rgvidhāna</i>
36	8	the features	features
	40	ancien	ancient
37	2	<i>Ra nāyāna</i>	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
38	15	<i>yuddhakāṇḍa</i>	<i>Uttarakāṇḍa</i>
40	6	;	delete
41	6	राव	राघ
43	7	<i>Illiad</i>	<i>Iliad</i>

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
43	17	<i>Illiad</i>	<i>Iliad</i>
44	45	one	delete
45	24	an	delete
49	5	<i>Illiad</i> and <i>Odyessy</i>	<i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i>
54	19	<i>Sauti</i>	<i>Śānti</i>
	30	Bīṣma's	Bhīṣma's
55	42	constains	contains
56	3	and	delete
60	42	not	the
61	10	six	five
64	2	KĀVA	KAVYA
66	7	pitated	pitiated
68	39	<i>Kumārsambhava</i>	<i>Kumārasambhava</i>
71	26	singular	singular in
	29	Dlīpa	Dilipa
	37	15	15th
72	2	been	be
79	2	consonant	consonant ²
	5	studied ¹	studied ³
82	42	language. These <i>Samskr̥ta</i> and	and <i>Samskr̥ta</i> languages. These
83	3	figurative	turn of
	15	is alone	alone is
86	7	Peddakomaṭ	Peddakomaṭi
86	44	<i>Rāṣṭraudha amśa-</i> <i>mahākāvya</i>	<i>Rāṣṭraudhava-</i> <i>mśamahākāvya</i>
87	3	<i>Rāgharapāṇḍa</i>	<i>Rāghavapāṇḍa</i>
	34	<i>Gaṇḡāvatarana</i>	<i>Gangāvatarana</i>
88	19	<i>Rāgha anaīśadhīya</i>	<i>Rāghavanaiśadhīya</i>
	41	predominationed	predominated
89	9	deserve	delete
93	39	devotional	devotion
94	42	वितनुभद्र ^c	वितनुभद्र ^c
95	37	<i>nāyakanayakabhava</i>	<i>nāyakanāyikābhāva</i>
97	27	of	delete
99	19	the	delete
101	28	spurions	spurious
103	9	a	delete
	28	He	It

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
104	29	gnoms	gnomes
105	36	रत्नैरिब	रत्नैरिब
107	20	Aryaśmetre	Aryā metre
	21	Srdharadāsa	Srīdharadāsa
108	12	Bhot	Boht
	18	K. P.	delete
	19	Parab	Sivadatta
109	20	absence	absence of
111	32	The	delete
117	20	it	he
119	1	yaśāstiaka	yaśastilaka
120	8	in	delete
	15	caaampus	campus
	20	have	delete
121	22	āsgara	sāgara
125	17	Vikrmāditya	Vikramāditya
129	4	Kāmandaki	Kāmandaka
131	4	prevalance	prevalence
132	4	in	delete
133	37	a	delete
	43	tnē	the
134	20	utt rarāmacarita	uttararāmacarita
135	10	succeds	succeeds
136	1	character	characters
	32	begining	beginning
140	4	prefection	perfection
	20	ttile	title
141	4	.	delete
143	12	Karṇbhāra	Karṇabhāra
144	15	protrays	portrays
145	38	avaiting	awaiting
146	27	Vikramorvśīya	Vikramorvaśīya
147	28	a ring to her	her his ring
148	3	happy	a happy
149	3	Vikramonaśīya	Vikramorvaśīya
	4	makes	makes his
152	43	medicant	mendicant
	46	In the	delete.
155	4	of a	delete
156	44	Aryakay	Aryaka
157	35	Ratnāvati	Ratnāvalī

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
159	40	Mālyvān	Mālyavān
159	41	मर्म	नर्म
161	32	has been	is
162	26	<i>R māyana</i>	<i>Rāmāyana</i>
163	9	embelishments	embellishments
164	6	Sīt	Sītā
	19	1 st	lost
167	11	Bhaiarva	Bhairava
	13	<i>Prakarna</i>	<i>Prakarana</i>
	14	which	It
	15	<i>Mal timadhava</i>	<i>Mālatīmādhava</i>
	22	<i>G ṅadhara</i>	Gangādhara
168	19	Sṛngratila a	Sṛngātilaka
	21	attribu ed	attributed
	27	<i>Sṛnagaramanjari</i>	<i>Sṛngāramanjari</i>
169	3	<i>Prahasna</i>	<i>Prahasana</i>
	8	<i>I a n ā mṛga</i>	<i>Ihāmṛga</i>
	9	<i>Gopālakedrikā</i>	<i>Gopālakelikriḍā</i>
	33	<i>Mohamudgara</i>	<i>Mohaparājaya</i>
	38	<i>Viṣiṭādvaita</i>	<i>Viśiṣṭādvaita</i>
174	13	<i>Śrīkaṭhacarita</i>	<i>Śrīkaṇṭhacarita</i>
	46	Rājnātha	Rājanātha
176	6	untelligible	unintelligible
	24	<i>Dhavani</i>	<i>Dhvani</i>
177	26	बीभत्साद्भुत	बीभत्साद्भुत
178	41	connected	connected with
179	44	earliest being the unknown authorship	being the earliest of unknown authorship
180	20	A Moghavarṣa	Amoghavarṣa
181	37	Bhamahas admit	Bhāmaha admits
182	36	<i>Dhrani</i>	<i>Dhvani</i>
183	12	Dhrani	Dhvani
	"	who	delete
184	9	<i>Dhavani</i>	<i>Dhvani</i>
187	25	<i>Alankāracūḍāmaṇi</i>	<i>Alankāracūḍāmaṇi</i>
188	19	pharases	phrases
190	20	post.	post-
192	45	the <i>Linganu asanavṛtti</i>	The <i>Lingānuśāsanavṛtti</i>
193	30	on it	delete
194	38	<i>Gaaapāṭha</i>	<i>Ganopāṭha</i>
197	23	<i>Sadbaṣacandrika</i>	<i>Sadbhāṣācandrikā</i>

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
198	25	<i>Vṛttatnāvali</i>	<i>Vṛttaratnāra'i</i>
199	20	<i>Nam līṅgā</i>	<i>Nāmalīṅgā</i>
	28	<i>Vaijayanti</i>	<i>Vaijayanī</i>
201	27	<i>Paṣṣkaraśādin</i>	<i>Paṣṣkaraśādi</i>
	39	water ³	water ²
203	44	10, 14	10 ¹⁴
204	8	800	500
	20	,	delete
	40	Johan	Jehan
206	6	religious duties	duties religious
	37	<i>Sukha-likhita</i>	<i>Sukha, Likhita</i>
207	29	<i>Parasasmṛti</i>	<i>Parāśarasasmṛti</i>
209	16	Bela	Bhela
211	16	<i>Bhelal</i>	<i>Bhela</i>
	30	<i>Aṣṭāṅgasaiṅnaha</i>	<i>Aṣṭāṅgasanṅraha</i>
	33	<i>Aṣṭāṅgahrdaya</i>	<i>Aṣṭāṅgahrdaya</i>
212	11	Lolimbaraja	Lolambarāja
	17	Vāgbhaṭa or Asvinīkumāra	Vāgbhaṭa, Aśvinī-
		or Nityanātha	kumāra and Nityanātha
	39	frankly and freely	frankness
213	6	ofter	after
215	11	<i>rthasāstra</i>	<i>Arthaśāstra</i>
216	13	<i>Kāvyālan ārasūtras</i>	<i>Kāvyālanākārasūtras</i>
	19	<i>Laghu Arhanniti</i>	<i>Laghvarhannīti</i>
220	22	The	They
	25	has	had
	44	literatura	literature
222	18	meditation	meditation
223	19	put	puts
224	18	three the	three
225	11	<i>Sukhāvatīvyūha</i>	<i>Sukhāvatīvyūha</i>
226	4	and	are his
227	13	in the under	in under
229	3	<i>syād āta</i>	<i>syādrāda</i>
232	43	<i>Nāyāya</i>	<i>Nyāya</i>
234	43	mirror	mirror
235	43	<i>avyakta</i>	<i>avyakta</i> and
238	3	<i>Mīmāmā</i>	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i>
239	40	<i>Mīmāmāsūtras</i>	<i>Mīmāmāsūtrabhāṣya</i>
	42	<i>Laghu</i>	<i>Laghvī</i>
242	8	called the	called

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
242	35	these means	by these means
249	18	one gets the soul	the soul gets
252	19	<i>Nyāyapariśuddhi</i>	<i>Nyāyasiddhāñjana</i>
255	2	religions	religious
	13	Upanisadci	Upanisadic
263	26	"	Drama

❀ श्री: ❀

A HISTORY OF THE SĀMSKRĀTA LITERATURE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Samskrta is the name given to the language which has been in use in India for religious and secular purposes since the very earliest times. This name was acquired by this language after 700 B.C. when *Pāṇini*, the grammarian framed the rules of grammar for this language. Before this period, it was called the divine speech *दैवी वाक्*. The very name *Samskrta*, as applied to this language, shows that the language became polished or refined. It is in this language that the literature of the Indians is found recorded. This language was also used for conversational purposes.

Two main stages are found to mark the growth of this language. They are (1) the Vedic period and (2) the classical period. During the first stage, the language was simple, natural and forcible. The major portions of the literature of the Vedic period were written in it. It bears likenesses to the language in the second stage in many respects. It displays varieties of grammatical forms. For instance, in the case of verbal forms, *Parasmaipada* and *Ātmanepada* terminations were freely used and were interchangeable. The infinitives had different endings like *चे*, *तवे* and *तवे* which yielded forms like *चचे*, *सुतवे* and *मादयतवे*. The indeclinable participles had forms ending in *त्वाय* as in *गत्वाय*, *देवायः*, *भगवायः* and such other words represented the peculiar forms of nouns in declension. All these forms disappeared in the classical period.

During the Vedic period, this language was used for both religious and conversational purposes. The priests, who made a correct use of it while performing the sacred rites, committed mistakes while using it in conversation. Attempts were made by many grammarians at various stages to frame rules with a view to prevent this abuse of the language. It was not until the 7th century B.C. that this purpose was achieved when *Pāṇini* wrote his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* laying down definite rules for this language. He was followed in the 5th Century B.C. by *Kātyāyana* also known as *Varauci* and in the 2nd century B.C. by *Patañjali*. Both these writers wrote

works supplementing the rules of *Pāṇini*. The strict rules, which these grammarians framed for this language, made it perfect. This period became the starting point of the classical period when this language acquired the name *Saṃskṛta*. It does not, however, mean that the classical language took its rise after the close of the Vedic period. The formation of the classical type is noticeable even before the close of the Vedic period as evidenced by the work of *Pāṇini* whose rules were made applicable to the Vedic language and to the language used for secular purposes. The latter was given the name *bhāṣā* by *Pāṇini*. The *bhāṣā*, which differed from the Vedic language in certain respects, represents the beginnings of the classical language in the Vedic period itself.

During the classical period, *Saṃskṛta* had a rich development. Topics of interest of religious and secular nature were discussed in this language. Poetic arts and dialectics found in this language an agreeable mode of expression. In fact, there is no subject of study which was not treated through the use of this language.

In the course of the development of this period, the language came to be possessed of certain special features notwithstanding the strict rules of *Pāṇini*. Under the influence of *Pāṇini*, the *bhāṣā*, which was in a growing condition, ceased to grow during this period resulting in the absence of dialectal variations which formed the main feature of the *bhāṣā* in the Vedic period. Contrary to the rules of *Pāṇini*, participles came to be used in the place of finite verbs. Sentences were framed leaving the finite verbs which were to be supplied. For the sake of brevity, compounds of inordinate length took the place of subordinate clauses. The restrictions, enforced by *Pāṇini* in regard to the use of the tenses denoting the past sense, came to be ignored. The pitch accent recognised by *Pāṇini* gave room for the stress accent. The verbal forms in the tenses have completely disappeared in the scientific treatises written after the 15th century A. D.

Side by side with the growth and development of the *Saṃskṛta* language, there has been growing a different language called *Prākṛta*. It was the language of the people. The word *Prākṛta* is derived from the word *Irakṛti* which means people. This language was used by those who were able to understand *Saṃskṛta* when spoken but were unable to use it as a means of expression. Though it had an independent existence, it was closely allied to *Saṃskṛta* and was greatly influenced by it. The special feature about this language was that it had no *Ātmanepada* verbal form.

That *Saṃskṛta* under the name *bhāṣā* was used for conversational purposes is borne out by certain evidences. *Pāṇini* framed his rules for the Vedic language and for the *bhāṣā*. *Patañjali* tells that the purpose of grammar is not to create words but to make clear what correct uses are. This statement presupposes the existence of a

spoken language for which a grammatical treatise was written by the grammarians. He tells further that there were sages deeply learned but using incorrect expressions like ' *yarvānastarvānaḥ* ' instead of using the correct form ' *yad vā nas tad vā naḥ* ; They did not commit any mistake while performing the sacred rites. Besides this, he gives an anecdote between a grammarian and a charioteer on the etymology of the word ' *sūta* ' and shows how, while a grammarian was not sure of the correctness of an expression, even laymen like a charioteer were aware of its correct usage. Further, it is said by *Patañjali* that people mispronounced certain words, e.g., *ṣaṣa* for *śaśa* ; *palāṣa* for *palāśa* ; *mañjaka* for *mañcaka* etc. *Pāṇini* and *Patañjali* speak of the dialects of the language which they treated in their works and also noted the usages in the various parts of the country. Certain suffixes were acceptable to the Easterners, certain others to the Northerners and some others to the *Kāmbojas*. The Southerners were fond of *taddhitas* *Pāṇini* notes the distinction in the meaning when words like *putrādinī* and ' *puttrādinī* ' are to be used. The former word means contempt, while the latter an actual occurrence as in the case of a she-serpent. While persons are to be called or addressed from a distance, the vowels at the end of the words in the vocative case are to be elongated. Detailed information is given about the terminology of dicing, the speech of herdsmen and the use of accent. These rules would become meaningless if *Saṃskṛta* had not been a spoken language. Further, the use of *Saṃskṛta* in the dramas by the male characters of superior type and of *Prākṛta* by the female characters and by the male characters of inferior status cannot be accounted for except by assuming that this discriminative use of the languages in the dramas was drawn from real life. The language of the epics and the *Purāṇas* points to the same conclusion.

In the classical period, *Saṃskṛta* became very popular as the spoken and literary language. Works in every branch of study were written in *Saṃskṛta*. It became the official language in the courts of kings. The Buddhists and the Jains, who preferred at first the use of *Prākṛta* to that of *Saṃskṛta* chose to use *Saṃskṛta* for literary purposes after the beginning of the Christian era. *Aśvaghoṣa*, the Buddhist philosopher of the 1st century A.D., used *Saṃskṛta* to write poems on Buddhistic themes. *Caraka*, the great physician of the same period, refers to the use of *Saṃskṛta* in their discussions by the men of his profession. Hieun-Thsang, the Chinese pilgrim of the 7th century A. D. records the use of *Saṃskṛta* by the Buddhists during his visit to India during this period. Siddharṣi, a Jain, wrote in 906 A. D. *Upamitibhāvaprapaṇcakathā* on a Jain theme. In that work, he speaks clearly of the advantage of *Saṃskṛta* over *Prākṛta* as a literary language. Bilhana, the Kashmirian poet of the 11th century A. D. tells that the women of Kashmir understood *Saṃskṛta*, *Prākṛta* and the language of Kashmir.

The works of the *Saṃskṛta* grammarians prevented the abuse of the language but made the language static. The result was that the gulf, which existed between *Prākṛta* and *Saṃskṛta* before it was effectively controlled by *Pāṇini*, began to grow from day to day. After a time, it became all the more widened because the poets, brought under the influence of the grammarians, made the language more and more artificial by playing with words and by using recondite expressions. As *Prākṛta* grew up, *Saṃskṛta* became less popular as a medium of expression and began to lose hold on society. This decadence of *Saṃskṛta* was noticed by those given to literary pursuits and they took steps into make *Saṃskṛta* regain its status. The writing of the *Hitopadeśa* and *Pañcatantra* shows the result of such attempts. The handbooks on rituals, called by the term 'prayoga', were also written in *Saṃskṛta* with the same object in view. These attempts, however, have not yielded appreciable results but have minimised the pace of decadence.

At the present day, *Saṃskṛta* is spoken as dead. It must be remembered that it was never a living language in the sense of a language of the entire population in India or in a region of India. A language is said to be dead when it ceases to exert organic influence on the people and other languages. When viewed in this sense, *Saṃskṛta* is not dead. It continues to live in the various languages of India which have been enriched through it and serves as the only force which could be made use of in uniting the people of India. In addition to this fact, it continues, as in former days, to be used for both secular and religious purposes by its few adherents.

Prākṛta, which was the spoken language of the public at large, became the literary language and continued to be the spoken language in the centuries which preceded the Christian era. In the 6th century B.C., Gautama the Buddha and Mahāvīra preached their doctrines in *Prākṛta*. During the days of King Asoka *Prākṛta* became the language of the state. Inscriptions of this period were written in *Prākṛta*. About the beginning of the Christian era, *Prākṛta* was found ineffective as the literary language even by its adherents who had to use *Saṃskṛta* in their discussions and debates with the Hindus. After this period, *Saṃskṛta* became the literary language even for the Buddhists and the Jains, although *Prākṛta* was not entirely given up particularly by the Jains.

As a spoken language, *Prākṛta* had many dialects. The chief dialects were (1) *Māgadhī* in which Gautama the Buddha preached his doctrines (2) *Ardhamāgadhī* in the old form of which Mahāvīra preached his doctrines and (3) *Śaurasenī*. The regions where these flourished were in the order, (1) Eastern lands now identified with Bihar, (2) Benares and the neighbouring regions and (3) the regions

of Muttra. Mahratti and Bengali have sprung from *Māgadhī*. From *Sauraseni* arose Eastern Punjabi, Hindi and Gujarati.

About 400 A.D. there came into being a dialect of *Prākṛta* under the name *Apabhramśa*. It occupied a position midway between the literary *Prākṛta* and modern vernaculars. It had a limited vocabulary. It was mainly responsible for the rise of modern vernaculars partly by influencing the dialects which already existed and partly by bringing new dialects into being. Bihari, Oriya and others appear to have taken their rise as a result of this influence of *Apabhramśa*.

In ancient India, writing was not in practice. Instructions were given orally. Words like, 'Śruti' as applied to the *Vedas*, 'Smṛti' to the law books, and *Sūkta*, 'anuvāka', and others used to denote divisions of passages and texts lend support to this contention. This is further attested by the terms 'anusvāra', 'visarga', 'jihvāmūliya', 'upadhmaniya' and others. In the works on grammar and in the epics, there are references to writing. The word 'lipi' is used in the sense of a script. The root 'likh' is used in the sense of placing the syllables or of scratching on stone or leaf. These references together with the inscriptions of Asoka, prove that writing was known and was probably practised about the period 3000 B. C. Owing to the absence of materials which could withstand destruction, it appears that writing was not practised.

The inscriptions of Asoka show that the art of writing was considerably developed in the 2nd century B. C. The national method of writing was from left to right although a coin is found to have the writing from right to left. The tree barks and palm leaves were the materials used for writing purposes. A stylus was used to scratch the forms of letters in the barks. The word 'masī' in the sense of ink was in use in the 2nd century B. C. The leaves, which were used for writing, were arranged and held together by a cord passed through the holes provided in the leaves at fixed places. Hence the works were called 'granthas'. Paper came to be used in the place of leaves after the advent of the Muslims in India in the 11th century A. D. The oldest palm leaf manuscript which is available is dated in the 8th century A. D. and the oldest paper manuscript is dated 1223 A. D. Even after the introduction of paper, palm leaves continued to be used in South India. While the Devanāgarī script is used in North India, the Andhra, Kannada, Malayalam and Grantha scripts are used in South India.

The literatures, in *Samskr̥ta* and *Prākṛta*, exhibit certain peculiar features. Firstly, there is no line of distinction between the works of artistic production and those of didactic nature. The works, which are purely artistic, contain in them statements of didactic nature and those of didactic importance are given an artistic colouring. Secondly, no restriction is found enforced in the use of a particular form of composition. A subject which is taken up for treatment is dealt with

by using the poetry form or the prose form. For instance, grammar, lexicography, medicine, astronomy, philosophy and others are treated in both forms. Thirdly, the tendency for the Indian writer was to analyse and subject the topic under discussion to a careful scrutiny. This tendency originally belonged to the writers on scientific subjects. Gradually this began to spread among the writers on all other subjects and this has resulted in the treatment, through this method, of topics belonging to grammar, rhetorics, politics, music, dramatic art and others. Fourthly, the scholars were inclined to explain and comment on the works of their predecessors. This was responsible for the writing of commentaries on the standard texts. Lastly, every work in India shows the influence of religion.

A critical and thorough study of Indian literature is beset with serious handicaps. Paucity of information about the writers and their works acts as a positive hindrance in this direction. The poets and writers had been completely reticent about themselves. Nor does any clue come forth from any other source. Nothing is therefore known about the identity of a poet, his date, his contemporaries and his other works. As a result of this lack of information, doubts begin to rise up on certain matters. Names like Vālmīki, Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Daṇḍin and others appear more as titles than as their real names. In some cases, the names of poets are remembered their works being lost, e.g., Bhaṭṭāra-haricandra, Meṇṭha and others. Sometimes, poets, having the same names, are credited with the authorship of works not necessarily written by them but yet could not be denied their authorship, for such a denial does not have any support.

What is said so far must be true of Kālidāsa and a host of other poets. Bhavabhūti and a few others gave some useful information however, about themselves. Generally earlier the poet, greater is the difficulty felt in knowing about him. Really speaking, the *Vedas*, the epics, the *Purāṇas* and other texts could be considered as works containing informations of historical importance. Some among them contain vivid accounts of court life and contemporary events.

Added to these handicaps is the loss of valuable works. The Greeks and the Arabians took away with them some rare works which are not available now either with them or with the Indians. In their attempts to save themselves from the Hindu critics, the Buddhists took away with them to Tibet and China valuable works which they translated into Tibetan and Chinese. The British and the Germans have also taken rare works away from India. Recovery of at least some of these lost works may throw light on the literary history of ancient India.

Fortunately, there, are certain land-marks now available which help the understanding of the literature of India. Gautama the

Buddha died in 485 B. C. Alexander invaded India in 326 B. C. Candragupta, the Mauryan emperor ruled the land in the period 320—298 B. C. This period is of importance, as Megasthenes was the Greek ambassador in the court of Candragupta, the accounts of whose reign, were included by him in his records on his connections with India. Asoka was a king from 269 B. C. to 232 B. C. His inscriptions are valuable from the points of linguistics, religion and politics. The Chinese pilgrims Fa-hien, Hieun-Thsang and I-tsing, who visited India in the periods 399-414, 629-645, and 672-75 A. D., wrote valuable records of their visit to India during these periods. Of equal importance are the records of Alberuni who visited India about 1030 A. D. Besides these, the coins, inscriptions on pillars, and copper-plate grants help us by giving useful hints on historical events. The nature of the style of a work also determines the age of its composition. The anthologies and the works on rhetorics give useful information in determining the chronology of the Indian literature.

The historical study of the *Sanskṛta* language and its literature was begun by the travellers and the missionaries who came to India from Europe from the 16th century A. D. The discovery of *Sanskṛta* and the close affinity, which it displays to the languages of Europe like Greek and Latin, made them take a keen interest in the study of *Sanskṛta*. The study of the Comparative Philology was begun as a result of the efforts of Schlegel, a German scholar who wrote, in 1808, a work on the Language and Wisdom of the Indians. These scholars took great interest in the study of the *Vedas* and the sciences. Sir William Jones, and H. T. Colebrooke among the British ; and Buhler, Keilhorn, Francis Bopp, Grimm, Grassmann, Jespersen, Wackernagel, Roth, Max Muller, Weber and others among the Germans, were the writers who were responsible for the valuable contributions they made for enriching the Indian literature. They also brought out good editions of the Indian works together with translations in the European languages. Bhartṛhari's poem was translated in 1651 into Dutch by Abraham Roger, and the *Śākuntalam* in 1789 into English by Sir William Jones which won the appreciation and admiration of Herder and Goethe. The *Manusmṛti* was published in 1794 and the *Bhagavadgītā* in 1785 by Charles Wilkins. The Vedic texts were published by Max Muller and the *Rigveda* was translated by the same author. These are some of the works which the critics of the west took up for historical study.

The efforts of the host of the scholars of the west who made a beginning in the critical study of the literature of India and of the Indian scholars who, following their lead, devoted themselves earnestly to the proper understanding of Indian literature have borne fruit in many directions. It is these Western scholars that opened the door leading to scientific research and also provided the Indians

with keys to open other doors till now unopened. Still, the results arrived at by them are to be accepted with reservations. Bent on discovering historical facts in their researches, these scholars did not take into consideration the circumstances which could have prompted the Indian writers in writing their compositions and without which an impartial estimate of a literary product could not be had. They treated the religious spirit and the spirit of toleration which characterise the Indian literature as positive defects marring the artistic effect and the real value of this literature. They formulated certain theories which have been arrived at in their own way. These theories are, very often, opposed to the actual state of affairs. Especially regarding the authorship of certain texts, the extent of the original text and the dates of the poets, their conclusions are one-sided and detrimental to the greatness of the Indians. Besides, they are not final.

A study of the *Sanskṛta* literature is, therefore, to be based on the lines of the Western critics avoiding at the same time the defects which have crept into the observations of these scholars. The limitations, which loom large before a keen student of the Indian literature as a result of the absence of information about historical facts, should be borne in mind and in the light of these limitations conclusions are to be drawn. It is then alone that a proper appreciation of the *Sanskṛta* literature would become possible.

CHAPTER II

THE VEDAS

The Vedic literature consists of the *Vedas* and the works allied to them. The word '*Veda*' is derived from the root '*vid*' which means to know. Therefore, *Veda* is that which serves as the means to get knowledge. The *Vedas* are held by the Indians as the sacred sources of knowledge.

The *Vedas* are four in number under the names *R̥gveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda* and *Atharvaveda*. The *R̥gveda* comprises hymns called '*ṛks*' which are metrical in form. These hymns are composed in stanzas generally of four lines, sometimes of three only and at others of two only. '*Gāyatrī*', '*Anuṣṭubh*', '*Jagatī*' and others are the well-known metres in which these hymns are found composed. These hymns are in the form of praise of the deities. Some among them are sacrificial hymns and some philosophical hymns. The major portions of the *Yajurveda* are written in prose. The word '*Yajus*' means worship. This *Veda* contains the hymns of the *R̥gveda*. The purpose of this *Veda* is to explain and expound the significance of the performance of the sacred rites while performing which the hymns of the *R̥gveda* are to be recited. *Śuklayajurveda* and *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* are the two branches of this *Veda*. The *Sāmaveda* can be called the *Veda* of songs. The word '*Sāman*' means propitiation. The major portion of this *Veda* consists of the hymns of the *R̥gveda*. The hymns included in this *Veda* are to be sung. The modes of singing them are two viz., *ūhagāna* and *ūhyagāna* which are also called *grāmagāna* and *āranyagāna* respectively. The *Atharvaveda* deals with charms and chants to be used for offensive and defensive purposes. It contains songs and spells to get long life, for expiation and for the restoration of harmony in family life. Directions for keeping away the evil spirits and for cursing the demons are given in the hymns of this *Veda*. Hymns of theosophical nature are not absent in it. This *Veda* also contains the hymns of the *R̥gveda*. The *Atharvaveda* has nothing to contribute directly to the performance of the sacred rites which form the main subject of treatment of the other three *Vedas*. Hence for a long time, this *Veda* was not grouped with the other three. The *Puruṣasūkta* does not mention this *Veda* while it mentions the other three. The term '*trayī*' was applied only to the other three. It is only at a later period that it was considered a *Veda* on a par with the other three and was included in the list of *Vedas* as the fourth.

The text of each *Veda* is of four parts viz., *Samhitā*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Āraṇyaka* and *Upaniṣad*. The *Samhitā* portion refers to the passages

which are hymns of praise and which are required to be recited or sung during the performance of the sacred rites. The *Brāhmaṇa* portion refers to the passages which are explanatory of the ritualistic aspect of the hymns. The *Āraṇyaka* portion refers to the passages which concern with the rites to be performed by a man when he leads a life of retirement in the forest. The *Upaniṣads* represent the final stage containing the philosophical doctrines which are to be imparted to worthy disciples.

The *Samhitā* portions of the *Vedas*, the *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Śuklayajurveda* and the *Brāhmaṇa*, *Āraṇyaka* and *Upaniṣad* portions of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* are accented. In these texts, the accent is musical depending upon the pitch of the accent. There are three accents by the names *udātta*, *anudātta* and *svarita*. *Udātta* means raised, *anudātta* low pitch and *svarita* sounded and these correspond to acute, grave and circumflex accents respectively. In the *R̥gveda*, the *udātta* is not marked, the *anudātta* is marked by a horizontal stroke below the syllable and the *svarita* by a vertical stroke above the syllable. In the other *Vedas*, they are marked differently.

These texts were ordinarily recited and handed down orally from preceptor to pupil. Much care was enforced on the student to get the texts by heart without a single error in pronunciation and accent. The *Vedas* came to be called *Śruti* owing to this system of their study.

Some devices were adopted to keep the *Vedas* from becoming corrupt. *Samhitāpāṭha*, *padapāṭha*, *kramapāṭha*, *jaṭāpāṭha* and *ghana pāṭha* were the five devices which were adopted for this purpose. The *samhitāpāṭha* represents the Vedic passage as such and as it is recited. The *Padapāṭha* represents the stage in which the *samhitā* is split up into words. If the *samhitāpāṭha* were to be represented symbolically by *abc*, then *a*, *b*, *c*, would represent the *padapāṭha*. The rules were framed and observed to account for the phonetic changes at the end and at the beginning of such words which have been so split. This helped the restoration from the *padapāṭha* of the *samhitā pāṭha* as purely as it was before the *padapāṭha* was formed out of it. The *kramapāṭha* was formed by taking every word of the *padapāṭha* once with the preceding word and again with the following word, *ab*, *bc*, *ca* would represent the *kramapāṭha*. The *jaṭāpāṭha* is had by the combination of the *kramapāṭha* stated in three ways. *ab*, *ba*, *ab*, *bc*, *cb*, *bc* would represent the *jaṭāpāṭha*. The *ghanapāṭha* is formed by the same combination stated in five ways. *ab*, *ba*, *abc*, *cba*, *abc* would represent the *ghanapāṭha*. With the help of these devices, the *samhitāpāṭha* was split up in four ways with the reconstruction of it made possible from the four *pāṭhas*. Thus the *Vedas* were kept intact all these years. In spite of the oral tradition which was practised in handing them down to posterity, no change, even in a syllable or accent, has crept into them.

CHAPTER III

THE VEDAS AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE CRITICS OF THE WEST

In the course of their critical study of the *Vedas* which were treated side by side with the *Zend Avesta* the Zoroastrian scriptures, the scholars of the West were struck by the similar features exhibited by the *Vedas* and the *Zend Avesta*. The words, used in them were in some cases, similar in sense and formation. For instance, *mitra* in the *Vedas* and *mihira* in the *Zend Avesta* were found to mean the sun ; *vrtrahan* in the *Vedas* and *verethraghna* in the *Zend Avesta* meant the war-god and were phonetically similar ; *asura* in the *Vedas* and *ahura* in the *Zend Avesta* were phonetically similar but had different meanings, *asura* meaning a demon and *ahura* a god ; *soma* in the *Vedas* and *haoma* in the *Zend Avesta* meant a drink. Both the scriptures refer to the ceremony of *upanayana*. On the strength of these features, the learned critics have drawn the conclusion that from among the people who were living ages ago in Persia and her neighbouring areas, one section moved eastward and entered into India about 3000 B. C. These were the Aryans. At first they settled in Punjab where they were able to get a peaceful living. Feeling grateful at this, they began to propitiate Nature which was deified by them. Their prayers, offered on this occasion, were composed in those expressions with which they have been familiar during their settlement in Persia and other regions. Owing to the efflux of time since their departure from Persia, their language underwent certain phonetic changes. *Rgveda* was the name given to the work comprising these prayers. During their stay in Punjab, only a portion of the *Rgveda* was composed. As they moved further to the east, the remaining portions were composed. This is proved by the absence of references to the R. *Gangā*, to the tiger, and to rice in these portions. References to these are available in the portions written at a later period. Chapters 2 to 7 were composed in these regions and the remaining chapters 1, 8, 9 and 10 were composed at a later period in different places. The *Yajurveda* and the *Sāmaveda* were composed in the regions lying on the banks of the R. *Yamunā*. The *Atharvaveda* was composed after the Aryans settled in Bengal. That the *Rgveda* was composed long before the other *Vedas* is proved by the large number of the hymns of the former which are found incorporated in the latter.

Not only were the *Vedas* composed at different periods but the portions in each were also composed at different periods. The early settlers who expressed their gratitude to the deities in the form of the

hymns of the *Rgveda*. besought the help of those deities in the hour of need by reciting those hymns. At a certain stage, they found that mere prayers did not serve the purpose and that something beyond these prayers was necessary to win the favour of the deities. The performance of the sacred rites was considered by them as the means to serve this end. 'There was a time when the sacrifices' 'were dictated by the free impulse of the human heart, by a yearning to render thanks to some unknown Being, and to repay, in words or deeds, a debt of gratitude, accumulated from the first breath of life.' The worship of fire, the drinking of *soma* juice and other rites formed the noteworthy features of these rites. While performing these rites, the hymns of the *Rgveda* were recited. With a view to ensure the correct performance of these rites, certain passages, of the *Veda* which gave a clue as to the mode of performing the rites, were taken up and expounded so that they could be applied easily to their performance. These were recorded together with the corresponding hymns in a separate work which came to be called *Yajurveda*. On all these occasions, the hymns of the *Rgveda* were sung and for the purpose of securing efficiency and effect in putting the hymns to music, the *Sāmaveda* was composed. It contained the hymns of the *Rgveda* together with the necessary information for putting them to music. When the ritual side was thus in progress, a need was felt to take steps for defending the sacrificer from the attack of the enemies who did not lend support to the performance of such rites or who attempted to overpower the sacrificers. Evidently these enemies were the savage tribes who were the original inhabitants of India and who attempted to resist the foreigners from settling in the Indian soil. Steps were also taken to attack and overpower such enemies. These attempts took the shape of hymns and rites connected with the various deities. All these came to be recorded in the *Atharvaveda*.

The sacred rites were as many as there were deities and as many as there were purposes. The explanatory part of these rites assumed the shape of special texts called the *Brāhmaṇas*. The hymns and the rites were considered to be attached to each *Veda* and this resulted in the rising up of the *Brāhmaṇas* attached to each *Veda*.

Most of these rites were to be performed by a man in the company of the members of his family or of his clan. A man, who, having spent the major part of his life with the members of family, chose to lead a life of retirement in the forest, was expected not to give up the performance of the sacred rites all on a sudden. He was required to perform certain rites which suited him in the life of retirement. The hymns and the rites for him were given in the *Āraṇyakas*. Like the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Āraṇyakas* are many being connected with each *Veda*.

Those who settled thus in the forests would have liked to ascertain the basis for the performance of the sacred rites, the nature of the man performing them, the nature of the deity propitiated and such other details. Some of these settlers would have got tired of following the path of rituals. They would have aspired to understand the nature of the soul. Questions and answers on these topics must have sprung during this period. All these were collected together in the form of works called the *Upniṣads*. These also formed part of the *Vedas* and were attached to the concluding portions of the *Āranyakas*. The nature of the speculations contained in them shows that some of them must have been composed long time ago.

Although the division of the *Veda* is in this order, still it appears that portions, under each head in the different *Vedas*, were composed at different periods. The *Sāmaveda* was composed long before the portions of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* were written.

The hymns in the *Rgveda* are associated singly and also in groups with the names of certain sages. It is possible to treat these sages as the authors of these hymns. In some cases, the authors have been forgotten. Thus the entire text of the *Rgveda* was written by different authors at different periods. The same conclusion holds good in the case of the texts of the other *Vedas*. The earlier portions of the *Rgveda* were composed about 3000 B. C. The *Vedas*, in their entirety, were available before 600 B. C. when Gautama the Buddha took note of the existence of the *Vedas* and preached his doctrines opposing certain doctrines recorded in them.

The critics of the West, when they began to study the *Vedas*, took for consultation the commentaries on the *Vedas* written by the Indian writers. The explanations, offered in these texts for certain passages, were found unconvincing and also misleading. The critics, therefore, thought it wise to interpret the passages from the context. The *Vedas*, in particular the *Rgveda*, did not appear to them to contain a word unusual, difficult or obscure necessitating a reference to the commentaries. Of course, they took the help of the commentators but did not treat them as the sole guides in the interpretation of the *Vedas*. 'As regards its more peculiar and difficult portions,' they thought, 'it must therefore be interpreted mainly through itself.' They began to apply the comparative method of study to the understanding of the *Vedas*.

In their opinion, a study of the *Vedas* reveals that the early settlers in ancient India were pastoral people. Their houses were made of wood. Their food consisted of ghee, milk, grains, vegetables, fruits and meat. The vessels were made of metals or earthenware. The drinking vessels were made of wood. The use of liquor was restricted. Cattle-breeding was the main occupation in the earlier

stages. Later on, agriculture and hunting came to be practised. They had to practise warfare to defend themselves from the attacks of the enemies. The bow and the arrows were the weapons used for this purpose. Armours and helmets were made of metal. Boats were used for crossing the rivers. Barter was the system of exchange. Gambling and dice were practised. Dancing and music were highly developed. The drum, flute and the lute were the instruments of music. Among the domestic animals, the cow occupied a prominent position. 'The sanctity of the cow has not only survived in India down to the present day, but has even gathered strength with the lapse of time.' 'To no other animal has mankind owed so much, and the debt has been richly repaid in India with a veneration unknown in other lands.'¹

Patriarchy was the mode of the family system. A priest was at their home as their guide. The marriage customs were the same as those which prevail in the present day. The women occupied a prominent position in the house. She was called *grhapatnī*. The birth of a son was looked upon as a prosperous event. Those who were sonless adopted another's son.

The caste-system took a definite form during this period. The Brahmins were the priests. The Kṣatriyas were the rulers. The Vaiśyas were the traders. The Śūdras were the servants of the above mentioned three classes of peoples. This system was evolved to maintain the social standard of the society. It was based on the nature of avocations pursued by the people. There were wheelwrights, carpenters, weavers who made clothes from wool, rope-makers, jewellers, actors and many other classes of people who pursued different walks of life.

The Aryans were split up into numerous tribes, each tribe representing a political unit. Monarchical was the system of government. Kingship was hereditary. The power of the king was, however, limited by the will of the people. In war, the chariots were in use. The horses and elephants, though referred to in the earlier portions of the Vedas, do not appear to have been used for purposes of war by the earlier settlers.

The standard of morality during this period was very high. Adultery and rape were counted as the most serious among the offences. Monogamy and the virtues of practising it were fully recognised. Still, polygamy thrived along with it.

Burial and cremation were the two means adopted to dispose of the dead. Cremation was more common and burial, particularly, in the later period became restricted in its applicability to the specific cases of the dead.

While the *R̥k*, *Yajus*, and *Sāmavedas* throw light on the religious and secular aspects of the life of the early settlers, the *Atharvaveda* contains a mine of information on the secular side alone. Spells and charms were in use to combat diseases and enemies. This *Veda* gives some information on the topics, connected with medicine, astrology and astronomy. Spells are given to get prosperity in the house and in trade.

The *Vedas* in general, besides giving hymns and directions for the performance of the sacred rites, contain hymns connected with wedding, funeral and other happenings. Cosmogonic and didactic hymns are found in plenty. Events connected with the lives of Sunahśepha, Purūravas and Urvaśi, Yama and Yami and others are found here recorded.

During the earlier period, the Aryans worshipped the forces of Nature to which physical aspects amounting to anthropomorphism were attributed. However, there is no reference to the idols in the *Vedas*. Among the gods, Varuṇa, Indra and Agni were prominent. Varuṇa was the great upholder of the moral order. As days passed on, he came to occupy a secondary position and he became the lord of the sea. Indra also came to lose in the later period his eminent position as the most favourite god in charge of rain but continued to maintain his position as the lord of gods. Agni is next in importance. He continued to maintain his position, for he was more intimately connected with the sacred rites. Savitr, Sūrya, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and others are given prominence in the earlier portions and they have become more popular at the end of the Vedic period. Mitrāvaruṇa. Aśvins, Maruts, Vasus, Ādityas and others are gods in groups. Rātri, Pṛthivī, Sarasvatī and others are female deities. The all-comprehensive group Viśvedevāḥ comprising all the gods became popular in the middle of the Vedic period. Another special feature is the deification of the attributes like sraaddhā, manyu, kāma and others. One another feature is that among these deities, each one is praised as the highest in the particular context. Max Muller while referring to this feature writes 'when Agni, the lord of fire, is addressed by the poet, he is spoken of as the first god, not inferior even to Indra. While Agni is invoked, Indra is forgotten, there is no competition between the two, nor any rivalry between them or other gods. This is a most important feature in the religion of the *Veda*.'¹

Kathenotheism and polytheism are the two aspects of the philosophic outlook of the Vedic literature. The latter period recognises God as personal and as a creator. It can be said that polytheism of the earlier period gave room to monotheism in the later period. Immanence of the Supreme Being is also recognised.

1. History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature by Max Muller. P. 546.

No reference is found in the *Vedas* about discussions regarding the existence of souls. After long periods of trials, the souls were yearning for eternal rest. Hence they set a high value for the future at the risk of the present. This made the early settlers recognise the two goals for the dead *viz.*, the path of the gods and the path of the fathers. Firm believers, as they were in the theory of transmigration of souls, they did not doubt the existence of the souls and hence the *Vedas*, particularly the earlier portions, breathes a spirit of optimism thus proving that the early settlers had belief in a better status after death.

CHAPTER IV

A CRITICISM OF THE VIEW OF THE WESTERN CRITICS.

The results achieved by the western critics by their study of the Vedic texts were summarised in the previous chapter. The critics have expressed in unmistakable expressions what they considered about the *Vedas*. The opinion of the Indians on this subject is worth referring to in the context. An approach to the study of the conclusions drawn by the western critics is also worth taking up here.

The Hindu mind has a different conception of the Vedic literature. *Veda* is that work which teaches that means, which is not worldly, by adopting which what is desirable is obtained and what is undesirable is avoided.¹ In other words, the *Veda* teaches what is good and what is bad. In this respect, the *Vedas* are of unquestioned authority. They are the scriptures of the Hindus.

The *Vedas* are of two parts viz., *Karma-kāṇḍa* and *Jñānakāṇḍa*. The former comprises the *Samhitā*, *Brāhmaṇa* and *Āraṇyaka* portions and the latter the *Upaniṣad*. The former portion is concerned with the performance of the rites enjoined in them. The rites are four fold viz., *nitya* obligatory, *naimittika* produced by a special cause, *kāmya* performed through the desire of some advantage and *niṣiddha* prohibited. The latter portion deals with the nature of the individual souls, Supreme Soul and the world and the relation between them. Traditional opinion is the same as that of the western critics regarding the aim and purpose of the *Brāhmaṇas*, *Āraṇyakas* and *Upaniṣads*.

The *Vedas* are the records of the achievements of the ancient Hindus in the sphere of religion. Since the religious and secular aspects of life were never dissociated from each other in India, the *Vedas*, which are purely religious in spirit, contain slight accounts on secular matters. Therefore, according to tradition, the *Vedas* could not be looked upon as sources information on the life of the early settlers in the Indian soil.

Regarding the authorship of the *Vedas*, there are three views current among the Hindus. The first view states that the *Vedas* are not the compositions of any author. For the benefit of mankind, they were revealed at the time of creation by the Supreme Being. Not being the compositions of any writer, they are themselves valid. This is the view of the Vedāntins literally the followers of the *Upa-*

1. इष्टप्राप्त्यनिष्टपरिहारयोरलौकिकमुपायं यो ग्रन्थो वेदयति स वेद : । Śāyana's Introduction to the *Taittirīyasaṃhitābhāṣya*.

niṣads. The second view is that the world was never created nor was it ever destroyed and the *Vedas* have been in existence from time immemorial. They are the eternal and self-evident valid texts of wisdom and are highly authoritative. This view is held by the Mīmāṃsakas the followers of the *Karmakāṇḍa* portion of the *Vedas*. The third view is that the *Vedas* are the compositions of the Supreme Being. They are valid, their validity being proved by their being the compositions of the Supreme Being. This view is held by the *Naiyāyikas* who belong to the school of Indian logic. Names like Viśvāmitra, Gr̥tsamada, Vasiṣṭha and others, which are mentioned in the *Vedas* associated with certain hymns, are to be taken as the names of those seers who were the propagators of the Vedic religion through the particular portions with which their names are connected. From this, it becomes clear that the Hindus do not believe in attributing the *Vedas* to the authorship of man nor in the composition of the various parts of the *Vedas* at different periods.

As regards the interpretation of the *Vedas*, it must be admitted that the line of traditional interpretation is not an unbroken one. There were a host of writers who attempted to interpret the *Vedas*. Yāska (before 800 B. C.), who wrote the *Nirukta* on the etymology of the Vedic words, tells that there were as many as seventeen interpreters of the *Vedas* earlier to him. None of their works were available to him. While giving the derivations of the Vedic words, Yāska offers alternate derivations in some cases thus exhibiting his eagerness to make a sincere attempt to interpret the Vedic words. From this, it becomes clear that he was not quite certain about the traditional mode of Vedic interpretation. After Yāska there were a number of commentators. The *R̥gveda* was commented by Skandasvāmin (C. 600 A. D.), Mādhavabhaṭṭa, Mādhava, Veṅkaṭmādhava, Ānandatīrtha, Sāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭabhāskara, Śaḍguruśiṣya and others. The *Śuklayajurveda* was commented by Harisvāmin in the 7th century A. D., Udaya in the 9th century A. D., Uvaṭa in the 11th century A. D., Sāyaṇa, Mahīdhara who was also called Māhīdāsa and others. The *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* was commented by Bhaṭṭabhāskara, Sāyaṇa and others. The *Sāmaveda* was commented by Sāyaṇa Mādhava, Bharatasvāmin and others and the *Atharvaveda* by Sāyaṇa. Sāyaṇa, who lived in the latter half of the 14th century A. D., was the only writer who wrote commentaries on all the four *Vedas*. Others commented on one full *Veda*, or on portions of the Vedic literature. The *Vedārthaprakāśa*, the commentary written by Sāyaṇa and those by some others, are now completely available while the rest exist in parts.

A study of these commentaries shows that the line of traditional interpretation of the Vedic texts was not continuous. Still these commentators have attempted to interpret the *Vedas* to the best of their ability and to offer alternate explanations wherever they

were not convinced with their own explanations. These commentators belonged to the line of scholars who studied and understood the *Vedas* and performed the rites enjoined by them. Therefore, they were quite familiar with the words occurring in the *Vedas* and were proficient in the Vedic lore. Being fully aware of the meaning of the Vedic passages, they were qualified to interpret the *Vedas* and therefore are the reliable exponents of the Vedic tradition. For instance, in his introductions to the commentaries to the *Vedas*, Sāyaṇa gives valuable information about the nature of the *Vedas* and their interpretation. He states the reasons put forward by some critics about the futility of interpreting the *Vedas* in which they had no faith and meets their objections in a convincing way and finally stresses the need for the interpretation and study of the *Vedas*. While interpreting the Vedic passages, he makes use of his knowledge of the principles of the *Mīmāṃsā* system which are very essential for a proper understanding of the *Vedas*. He takes into consideration the valuable help rendered by the six supplements¹. The commentaries by others also contain valuable information about the Vedic literature. These commentaries could not be dismissed as valueless. But for these commentaries, even the western critics would not have been in a position to understand what the Vedic tradition is.

The interpretation of the *Vedas* which was undertaken by the critics of the west has not served the intended purpose, for it was taken independently and regardless of the Vedic tradition recorded in these commentaries. The real sense in which the words are found used in the *Vedas* cannot be ascertained without the aid of the Indian commentators. Since one and the same word used in *Saṃskṛta* is capable of yielding more than one sense, the student of Vedic study has to depend entirely on the traditional mode of interpretation. The historical method of study, which fails to take into confidence, the view of Indian commentators, will help the critic to get any meaning for the Vedic passages and not the meaning which might have been intended by those responsible for the Vedic tradition. Besides, the scholars of the West have failed to take into consideration the epics and the *Purāṇas* dismissing them as purely legendary and mythological. In fact, the contents of these works are based on those of the *Vedas*. These works form the supplements of the *Vedas*². Therefore the interpretation of the *Vedas* without reference to these supplements would not bring out the real estimate of the *Vedas*. The historical method

1. The six supplements are :—(1) शिष्टा phonetics (2) व्याकरणम् grammar (3) छन्दः metre (4) निरुक्तम् etymological explanation of Vedic words (5) ज्योतिषम् astronomy and (6) कल्पः ceremonial.

2. इतिहासपुराणयोर्वेदं समुपहृदयेत् ।

Mahābhārata Ādi parvan 1. 293

of the study of the *Vedas*, based on the commentaries of Śāyana and conducted with reference to the epics, *Purāṇas*, the six supplements of the *Vedas* and the principles of the *Mīmāṃsā*, system, would disclose the contents and value of the Vedic literature. A number of Indian scholars have already begun the study of the *Vedas* in this direction.

The conclusions arrived at by the western critics regarding the home of the *Vedas* and the original home of the people of the Vedic period do not appear to be final. That some tribes came into India about 3000 B. C. from Persia and the neighbouring regions is sought to be proved by the critics on the strength of certain expressions which are found in the *Zend Avesta* and the *Vedas* to be similar in sense and in form. Generally speaking, such expressions found in any two different languages would prove either that those who used those languages lived together in the same region, or that they lived in different regions having cultural contacts which could have given rise to the appearance of such expressions. In the present case, there is no evidence to prove that the followers of the *Zend Avesta* and of the *Vedas* were one set of people inhabiting Persia and the neighbouring regions. The theory of the critics of the West regarding this point is only hypothetical. If on the strength of this evidence, the Aryans are stated to have migrated into India, it is equally possible to state that a section of the people in India migrated from India and settled in Persia. The reasons adduced in support of the Aryan immigration into India are equally strong to support the migration of people from India. In the absence of an authentic evidence to support any such migration, it would be wise to hold, on the strength of evidences available, that the so-called Aryans lived in India itself. They had contacts with those who lived in Persia. As a result of these contacts, there arose expressions and habits among both the peoples exhibiting similar features. Such contacts are noticeable in the growth of every nation. The contact with the European nations has perceptibly influenced the Indians in matters of dress, speech, customs and manners. If, on the other hand, this explanation is to be treated as baseless, the Egyptian civilization which resembles closely the Persian, Aryan and Tamil civilisations cannot be accounted for. Therefore it is better to hold that the home of the Aryans has been India itself. Regarding the home of the *Vedas*, nothing can be said definitely but from the geographical knowledge available from the *Vedas*, the epics, and the *Purāṇas*, it appears that those who followed the Vedic tradition were originally the inhabitants of the western part of India whose frontiers in the west and in the north extended beyond Sind, and Kashmir.

It will not be out of place here if a passing reference is made to the word Aryan used by the western critics to refer to those

who settled in India. The word *Ārya* in the *Saṃskṛta* language means a person of noble conduct and does not denote any race or nation. A person, recognised by the western critics as an *Ārya*, would cease to be an *Ārya* if he misbehaves. It appears that this word Aryan, as applied to a group of people, was only invented by the critics and that it is wrong to attribute to it a sense which could not be conveyed by it.

Since the event of Aryan immigration could not be supported by any evidence, the question of the date of this immigration does not arise. Still the date of the composition of the *Vedas* requires a careful study. From the knowledge available at the present day from the study of the *Vedas*, it is difficult to find out when the *Vedas* were composed. However, evidences are available from other sources which are not of a decisive nature. The preachings of the Buddha recognise the existence of the Vedic texts in full. The *Mahābhārata*, which was composed about 3100 B. C., admits the existence not only of the four *Vedas* as such but also of their branches. The author of the *Mahābhārata* got the name Vyāsa for having arranged the *Vedas*. This epic knows the work *Rāmāyaṇa* as that of Vālmīki. Vyāsa refers to Vālmīki as a sage of by gone days and as the author of the epic *Rāmāyaṇa*. From this it is clear that the *Rāmāyaṇa* must have been composed long before the period of the *Mahābhārata*. This epic refers to the popularity of certain recensions of the *Vedas* thus proving the composition of the *Vedas* long before its period. Therefore a definite date cannot be suggested to the *Vedas*. It would be wise to remain content for the present with the belief that the *Vedas* are the oldest literary products of India.

CHAPTER V

THE SAMHITA, BRAHMANA AND ARANYAKA PORTIONS OF THE VEDAS

The *Rgveda samhita* consists of 1017 hymns or 1028 hymns including *vālakhilya* hymns. It is divided into ten sections called *maṇḍalas*. There is another division of this *Veda* into eight sections each section being called *aṣṭaka*. This latter division is followed by the Indian tradition. The western scholars hold that the *R̥ksamhitā* was composed by different writers at different periods. The hymns, in the six *maṇḍalas*, beginning with the second, are ascribed to one sage. These *maṇḍalas* have uniformity in character and internal arrangement. Therefore, these must have formed the nucleus of the *R̥ksamhitā*. The hymns in the eighth *māṇḍalas* are ascribed to two sages and those in the other *maṇḍalas* to a number of sages. The whole of the ninth *maṇḍala* is about the *soma* sacrifice. These four *maṇḍalas* must have been composed at a later date by a number of sages and attached to the originally composed portion.

In the beginning, there were five recensions of this *Samhitā* viz., *Śākala*, *Bāṣkala*, *Āsvalāyana*, *Śāṅkhyāyana* and *Māṇḍūkeya*. Among these, the first recension alone, is now available, the second having only eight more hymns than the first and the remaining three having no appreciably distinct recensions and independent existence.

The *R̥ksamhitā* contains the hymns in praise of the various deities songs for sacrificial purposes, litanies for rituals, propitiatory and philosophical hymns, marriage benedictions, magic songs and others.

The *Yajurveda* comprises the hymns taken from the *Rgveda* and the prose passages which are explanatory of the *R̥gvedic* hymns from the ritualistic aspect. Therefore, this *Veda* is partly in prose and partly in poetry. Patañjali speaks of the 101 recensions of this *Veda*. Most of them have now disappeared.

This *Veda* has two branches viz., *Śukla yajurveda* and *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The former school came to be called *Śukla-yajurveda* because of the well arranged plan of the hymns. It is also accounted for to be due the tradition according to which this *Veda* was revealed by the sun. The latter school came to be called *Kṛṣṇa* due to the unarranged nature of its contents. The former branch has only the hymns to be recited and the latter has, in addition to them, discussions on the performance of the sacred rites.

The *Samhitā* of the *Śuklayajurveda* is known as *Vājasaneyīsamhitā* which is available in two recensions viz., *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyandina* differing slightly from each other. This *Samhitā* has forty chapters of which the last fifteen are treated to have been added later.

According to the Indian tradition, chapters 26-35 are considered to be supplementary (*khila*). This *Samhitā* deals with important sacrifices like *Vājapeya*, *Rājasūya*, *Āsvamedha*, *Sarvamedha* and others. The last chapter contains the *Īsopaniṣad*.

The *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* has four recensions viz., 1) *Kāṭhakaśamhitā* 2) *Kapīṣṭhala kaṭhasamhitā* which is available in fragments 3) *Maitrāyaṇīsamhitā* which is also called *Kālāpasamhitā* and 4) *Tāithiriyasamhitā* which has large followers in South India. The last-mentioned recension has two schools viz, that of *Āpastamba* and that of *Hiranyakeśin*, the distinction between them being on the side of the rituals. The former three recensions are also called by a comprehensive name the *Caraka* school. Patañjali speaks of the first and the third recensions as popular. Vālmīki tells that these were highly honoured at Ayodhyā. The third recension has four sections (*kāṇḍas*) while the fourth has seven.

The *Sāmavedasamhitā* comprises for the most part the hymns of the *R̥gveda*. There are only seventy-five hymns which belong entirely to this *Veda*. There are 1810 hymns in this *Veda* many of them being repeated. These are divided into two parts called *ārcika*, meaning a collection of the *ṛks* or hymns and *uttarārcika*, a later collection of the hymns. Leaving aside the repetition, the first part has 585 hymns and the second has 400 hymns. The hymns in the second part are grouped according to the metres in which they are composed, the deities to whom they are addressed and the sacrifices while performing which they are to be sung. This *Samhitā* contains various song books called *gaṇas* which give the rules for the prolongation, repetition and other changes to be affected while the hymns are sung. It is said that originally there were one thousand recensions of this *Samhitā*. At present only three of them are available. They are the *Rāṇayānīya*, *Kautuma* and *Jaiminīya* also called *Talavakāra*. While the *Samhitas* of the first and the third are available, that of the second is lost except for the seventh chapter.

The *Atharvaveda* is also called *Atharvāṅgiras*. *Bhṛgvaṅgiras* and *Brahmaveda*. The critics of the West find in the word *atharra*, a reference to the holy magic which was used to overcome diseases and thus used for constructive purposes and in the word *aṅgiras* a reference to offensive and destructive purposes. The word *atharvan* is taken to mean the priest and the wizard mixed in one. The *Samhitā* of this *Veda* is preserved in two recensions viz., *Saunaka* and *Paippalāda*. The former is well known and the latter is preserved in a single manuscript. The former has 731 hymns divided in twenty-one books. One-sixth of the entire portion is in prose.

Brāhmaṇas.

A *Brāhmaṇa* is considered to comprise the explanations offered by learned priests on the essential points of the rituals. The collections of such explanations varied according to the variety of the rituals. These explanations mention the connections between the hymns and the rites in which they are to find use. They contain accurate and minute directions regarding the performance of the sacred rites like the places to be occupied by the priests around the altar, the positions to be occupied by the sacred grass and others. In support of these explanations and directions, they contain certain stories. A sacred rite required the offices of four priests *hotṛ*, *udgātṛ*, *adhvaryu* and *brahman*. They are respectively connected with the *R̥k*, *Sāma*, *Yajus*, and *Atharvavedas*. The *adhvaryu* was in charge of the actual performance of the sacrifice. The *hotṛ* was to recite the hymns of the *R̥gveda* in a loud and distinct and the most accurate manner. The *udgātṛ* was to sing the hymns according to the rules of the *Sāmaveda*. The *brahman* was to watch the doings of the other priests and correct the mistakes if they commit any. He was expected to have mastered all the *Vedas* and be proficient with the details of the rituals.

While there are recensions in the *Saṁhitās*, there are no recensions in the *Brāhmaṇas*. Still, they are different according as the rites are and the recensions of the *Veda* to which the particular rites are attached.

To the *R̥gveda* are attached the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* in forty chapters and *Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa* also called *Śāṅkhyānabrāhmaṇa* in thirty chapters. To the *Sūklayaajurveda* is attached the *Satapathabrāhmaṇa* in the two recensions of *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyandina*. There are one hundred chapters in it grouped into fourteen sections (*kāṇḍas*). The first nine sections contain a comment on the first eighteen sections of the *Vājasaneyīsaṁhitā*. The sage *Yājñavalkya* is mentioned as the author of this *Brāhmaṇa*. The concluding portions contain the *Brhādāraṇyaka upaniṣad*. This *Brāhmaṇa* contains the stories of the fish, *Śakuntalā*, *Purūravas* and *Urvaśī* and others. The recension of the *Kāṇva* school has eighteen books. The *Taittirīyabrahmaṇa* is attached to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* and is in continuation of the *Taittirīyasaṁhitā*. The other recensions of this *Veda* have no *Brāhmaṇas*. To the *Sāmaveda* schools of *Tāṇḍins* and *Talavakūras* the *brāhmaṇas* are available. The *Kautuma* recension has no *brāhmaṇa*. To the *Tāṇḍya* recension are attached the *Pañcarīṃsa brāhmaṇa* and *Śaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇa*. The former is also called *Tāṇḍyāybrahmaṇa* and *Praudhabrāhmaṇa*. The title *Pañcviṃsabrāhmaṇa* must have been suggested by the number twenty-five of the books contained in it. The latter's is suggested by its containing only one book in

continuation of the *Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa*. The last six chapters in the *Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇa* are called *Adbhutabrāhmaṇa* which deal with rites done for the prevention of the evil effects which are likely to take place on extraordinary occasions. To the *Talavakāra* recension is attached the *Talavakārabrāhmaṇa* which has five books. The fourth book is called *Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa* which contains two lists of teachers of the *Sāmaveda* tradition and also *Kenopaniṣad*. The last book is called *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* containing a list of the composers of the *sāmans* which are particular kinds of the verses of the *Sāmaveda*. The *Chāndogyabrāhmaṇa* is also attached to the *Tāṇḍya* recension but it contains very little matter of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Except for the beginning it is *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. Besides these, there are three works attached to the *Sāmaveda* all of them called *Brahmaṇas* but all of them have only this title and their contents treat with some other topics. These works are the *Vaṃśabrāhmaṇa* containing a list of the teachers, *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa* on chants and *Devatādhyaṇabrāhmaṇa* on the deities of the *Sāmaveda*. To the *Atharvaveda* is attached the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* which is available in two books. Among these *Brāhmaṇas*, it is the *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa* alone that is in continuation of the *Taittirīyasamhitā*. Other *Brāhmaṇas* are independent texts. Except for the *Taittirīya* and *Śatapathabrāhmaṇas*, the *Brāhmaṇas* are unaccented.

Āraṇyakas

To the *R̥gveda* are attached the *Aitareyāraṇyaka* in eighteen chapters attributed to *Aśvalāyana* and the *Kauṣitakyāraṇyaka* in fifteen chapters. The first one-third portion of the fourteenth section of the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* is the *āraṇyaka* of the *Śuklayajurveda*. The *Taittirīyaraṇyaka*, attached to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* is in continuation of the *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa* and is accented. The first section in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* represents the *āraṇyaka* of the *Tāṇḍya* recension of the *Sāmaveda*. The *Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa* attached to the *Talvākāra* recension is, in fact an *āraṇyaka* of this recension. The *Atharvaveda* has no *āraṇyaka*.

All these three portions of the *Vedas* represent the *Karmakāṇḍa*. For purposes of the rituals, the literature, contained in these portions, is divided in a different manner into three parts viz., *mantra*, *vidhi*, and *arthavāda*. The first part deals with the hymns which are to be recited when the sacrifices are performed. The second part contains the directions enjoining the mode of performing a particular rite and prohibiting certain rites from being performed. The third part refers to the portions of the *Vedas* which explain the directions given in the second part and offer justifications for such directions. From this mode of division, it can be seen that the

Samhitā portion corresponds to that of *mantra*, *Brahmaṇa* and *Āraṇyaka* portions to those of *vidhi* and *arthavāda*.

The critics of the West place the literature of the *Karmakāṇḍa* of all the *Vedas* in the following chronological order as they are taken have been composed :—The *Samhitā* of the *R̥gveda*, *Yajurveda-samhitā*, *Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa*, *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa*, *Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa*, *Kauṣītukībrāhmaṇa*, *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*, *Śātapathabrāhmaṇa* and *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*.

CHAPTER VI

THE UPANIṢAD

Those who perform the rites prescribed in the *Karmakāṇḍa* go to heaven and have to return to earth after a definite time. Heaven is not a place of permanent bliss. Therefore one who is after everlasting bliss has to withdraw his mind gradually from the objects of the world. The purpose of the *Āraṇyakas* is to give a preliminary training in this direction to those who desire to get everlasting bliss. The next stage comes when the need arises to get discriminative knowledge which would help in understanding the value of the elementary principles needed at this stage as contrasted from all other principles of a subsidiary character. The need for this stage in a man's life is emphasised in the *Upaniṣads* which represent the *Jñānakāṇḍa*. After death, the soul migrates into another body as a result of the acts done in the previous birth. This kind of migration binds the soul to the body once again thus making the soul go in a mad search for material happiness. The *Upaniṣads* teach these principles and help the soul to desist from such pursuits. In the *Upaniṣads* are therefore found the evolution and growth of the theory of transmigration of souls. 'Here in the *Upaniṣads* are set forth in concrete example as well as in dogmatic instruction, two opposing theories of life an ignorant, narrow, selfish way of life which seeks temporary, unsatisfying, unreal ends; and a way of life which seeks to relate itself to the Supreme Reality of the universe so as to escape from the needless misery of ordinary existence into undying bliss.¹ To achieve this purpose, the *Upaniṣads*, deal with the nature of the individual souls, the Supreme Soul and the world and their mutual relation. The individual soul is referred to as *ātman* and *jīva*. The Supreme Soul is referred to as *Brahman* and *Ātman*. The *Upaniṣads* do not condemn the observance of the rituals. They recognise the observance of obligatory rites as a preliminary step to get to the higher step of knowledge (*jñāna*) which alone would lead the soul to the final goal.

The *Aitareya Upaniṣad* is attached to the *R̥gveda*. It describes the creation of the universe and teaches that true knowledge could put a stop to the transmigration of the souls. The *Kauṣītaki-upaniṣad* is also attached to the *R̥gveda*. It deals with the knowledge of the soul. The *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, which is attached to the *Suklayajurveda*, discusses the question of the origin of life for a soul and deals at length with its fears and happiness. Great stress is

1. Preface VII. Translation of the Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads by Robert Ernest Hume,

placed on the need for the meditation on soul. It contains the conversational accounts between the sage Yājñavalkya and king Janaka and others on the nature of the soul and the means to realise it. The *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, which is attached to the *Taittirīyasamhitā*, deals with the nature of the *Brahman* and this discussion is in the form of a dialogue between Varuṇa and his son Bṛghu. The *Mahānārāyanīyopaniṣad*, also called *Yājñikopaniṣad*, is also attached to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. To the same recension are attached the *Kāthopaniṣad*, and *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*. The former has two books each having three chapters. It gives the story of Naciketas who was given the knowledge of the *Brahman* by the lord of death. It deals with the true nature of the soul (*jīva*), the means to know the *Brahman* and the relation between the two. The soul, on account of ignorance, is not able to show itself and realise its nature as distinct from the body. By understanding the nature of death, one can overcome it. It is meditation that helps in the realisation of the nature of the Supreme and individual souls. The *Śvetāśvatara* contains the discourse of the sage Śvetāśvatara delivered to the people in his hermitage. The object of this *Upaniṣad* is to bring about a reconciliation between the *Śāṅkhya-Yoga* systems and the *Vedānta* system. The nature of the relationship between illusion (*māyā*), individual souls and the Supreme Soul is also discussed. To the *Maitrāyaṇīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* is attached the *Maitrāyaṇīyopaniṣad*. The *Iśopaniṣad*, which forms part of the *Vājasaneyīsamhitā* tells that those who get the knowledge of the Supreme Soul would find everything identical with the *Brahman* which is seen in the universe which, in its turn, is found in it. To the *Tāṇḍya* recension of the *Sāmaveda* is attached the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* which is didactic in form. It contains many dialogues between Uddālaka a sage and his son Śvetaketu. The idea of the universal soul is discussed in this work. To the *Talavakāra* recension of the *Sāmaveda*, is attached the *Kenopaniṣad* which speaks of the *Brahman* as the only absolute. The *Brahman* is the source of all forces in the world. Its nature is entirely different from things known and unknown. The *Muṇḍaka*, *Praśna*, and *Māṇḍukya* are attached to the *Atharva veda*. Strictly speaking, these are not connected with any Vedic school. From the *Muṇḍaka*, it is learnt that the *Brahman* dwells in the heart of man as the true self. Knowledge is two-fold viz., the higher and the lower. The former is concerned with the knowledge of the *Brahman* and the latter with the teachings of the *Vedas*. The *Praśnopaniṣad* is in the form of questions addressed by six students to sage Pippalāda who answers them. The origin of matter, life, division of life, three states of existence viz., dream, sleep, and waking and meditation on the *praṇava* are dealt with in this *Upaniṣad*. The *Māṇḍukya* deals with the infinite nature of the *Brahman*.

Almost all these *Upaniṣads* are only the continuations of the

Brāhmaṇa and *Āraṇyaka* portions of the *Karmakāṇḍa*. The *Taittirīya* and *Mahānārāyaṇīyopaniṣads* are accented. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Chāndogya*, *Māṇḍūkya*, *Taittirīya Aitareya*, *Maitrāyaṇīya*, and *Kauṣītaki* *Upaniṣads* are in prose resembling that of the *Brāhmaṇas*. The *Kaṭha*, *Isi*, *Śvetāśvatra*, *Muṇḍaka* and the *Mahānārāyaṇīya Upaniṣads* are in verse. The *Kena* and the *Praśna Upaniṣads* are partly in verse and partly in prose.

On the strength of language and contents, it is held that the *Praśna*, *Maitrāyaṇīya* and the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣads* are of later origin and the *Aitareya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Chāndogya*, *Taittirīya*, *Kauṣītaki* and *Kena Upaniṣads* represent the earliest stage.

Besides these fourteen *Upaniṣads*, there are a number of other *Upaniṣads*. Some of them are very old and many of very late origin. From among these, the leading exponents of the *Vedānta* schools have selected a few to comment on them or to cite quotations from them. Many among these are characterised by the religious spirit. They have very little of philosophical matter. It is held that there are one hundred and eight *Upaniṣads*. This list includes the above-mentioned fourteen *Upaniṣads*. As regards the subject-matter, they could be classified into six groups viz., (1) based on the *Vedānta* doctrine : 24 (2) based on *Yoga* : 20 (3) *Samnyāsa* : 17 (4) *Vaiṣṇava* : 14 (5) *Śaiva* : 15 and (6) *Śākya* and miscellaneous : 18. The reason for the springing up of so many minor *Upaniṣads* of varied contents must be found in the attempt of the followers of various religions and persuasions to have *Upaniṣads* representing their views.

The special feature of the *Upaniṣads* is that most of them are connected with one *Veda* or other. Some of them have connections with a particular *Veda*. Many of them have got nothing to do with the Vedic texts. The attempt to connect all the *Upaniṣads* with the *Vedas* resulted in the attribution of ten *Upaniṣads* to the *Rgveda*, nineteen to the *Śukla yajus*, thirty-two to the *Kṛṣṇayajus*, sixteen to the *Sāma* and thirty-one to the *Atharva*.

It appears, however, from a study of the contents of the *Upaniṣads* that but for a few traces of their being connected with a particular *Veda*, there is nothing peculiar in their method of treatment or subject of treatment as to make the followers of one Vedic school treat the various doctrines which they preach as belonging to one particular Vedic school and therefore purposeless for the followers of other schools. In fact, what they contain is treated as common to the followers of all Vedic schools. The different schools of the *Vedānta* system look upon these *Upaniṣads* as authoritative texts supporting their doctrines. Thus the *Jñānakāṇḍa* of the *Vedas*, unlike the *Karmakāṇḍa*, is not only the source from which the followers of the different systems of thought derive information in

support of their views but the one common authoritative text for all of them a reference to which cannot be denied by one school of thought to another. It is these *Upaniṣads* that have served as the strong foundations for the erection of the manifold structures of the systems of philosophy. .

CHAPTER VII

THE VEDĀNGAS

The study of the *Vedas*, the proper understanding and interpretation of them and the application of their principles while performing the sacred rites necessitated the rise of the supplements of the *Vedas* which are familiarly known as the *Vedāṅgas*. They are six in number viz, *Śikṣā* phonetics, *Vyākaraṇa* grammar, *Chandas* metre, *Nirukta* etymological interpretation, *Jyotiṣa* astronomy and *Kalpa* ceremonial. These are not distinct text books. They merely refer to the six subjects the study of which was useful for the understanding of the Vedic tradition and putting it to practise. *Śikṣā* and *Chandas* are aids for the reading and recitation of the *Vedas*, *Vyākaraṇa* and *Nirukta* for their understanding, and *Jyotiṣa* and *Kalpa* for putting to practise the knowledge gained by their. The origin of many of these supplements can be traced to the Vedic texts themselves to the *Brāhmaṇas* in particular.

Śikṣā is closely connected with the *Samhitā* of the *Vedas*. They contain instructions for the correct pronunciation and accentuation of the *Samhitās* of the *Vedas*. This subject is dealt with in the works called *Prātisākhya* which, as their name implies, were each connected with a particular recension of the *Veda*. They are written in the form of short rules called *Sūtras*. To the *R̥gveda* is attached the *R̥gvedaprātisākhya* of Śaunaka in the *Śākala* recension, to the *Sukla-yajurveda*, the *Vājasaneyīprātisākhyasūtra* of Kātyāyana in the *Mādhyandina* recension, to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* the *Taittirīyaprātisākhyasūtra*, to the *Sāmveda* the *Sāmaprātisākhya*, the *Puṣpasūtra*, the *Pañcavidhasūtra* and to the *Atharvaveda* the *Atharvavedaprātisākhyasūtra* also called *Cāturadhyāyikā*. The authors of some of these texts are not known. These *Prātisākhyas* contain clear traces forestalling their influence on the growth and development of grammatical studies.

Besides these, there are, a number of short treatises called *Śikṣās* dealing with the same subject. They are generally ascribed to the authorship of Bharadvāja, Vyāsa, Vasiṣṭha, Yājñavalkya and others. These are connected with particular *Prātisākhyas*. The *Vyāsaśikṣā* is one such treatise attached to the *Taittirīyaprātisākhya*.

Vyākaraṇa is treated as a supplement of the *Vedas*, since the reading and understanding of the *Vedas* would be impossible without the proper understanding of the use of words in their proper senses. The origin of grammatical studies is to be traced to the *Prātisākhyas*. Regarding the mode of formation of words, definite and diametrically opposed views were held by the grammarians in the early days

of the development of grammar. Śākaṭāyana a grammarian held the view that the nouns were derived from the verbs. Yāska and Pāṇini followed him. Gārgya and others, while recognising this view, derived its applicability to all nouns. Unfortunately the works of these authors are not now available. The earliest text on grammar now available is the *Aṣṭādhyaṣī* of Pāṇini. He mentions Pāuṣkara-sādi, Śākaṭāyana, Senaka and other grammarians who preceded him. It is only from his work that the views held by the ancient grammarians are known. Pāṇini wrote his work for the Vedic language and for the *bhāṣā* which was spoken in his days. The results achieved by these grammarians are profound. 'The Sanskrit grammarians of India were the first to analyse word forms, to recognise the difference between root and suffix, to determine the function of suffixes, and on the whole to elaborate a grammatical system so accurate and complete as to be unparalleled in any other country.'¹

Chandas deals with the metres and their rules applicables to the metres in which the Vedic hymns are composed. The *Nidānasūtras*, in ten sections, explain the nature and the names of Vedic metres and contain an index to the metres of the Vedic hymns. The *Chandaś-sūtra* of Piṅgala, though not of late origin, does not deal with the Vedic metres.

Nirukta represents the early attempts made to interpret the *Vedas*. The earliest known text is the *Nirukta* of Yāska (before 800 B. C.). The works of seventeen predecessors in this field whom he mentions were not available to him. The words, selected from the *Vedas* to be explained in the *Nirukta*, fall into three groups viz., *Naighaṇṭukakāṇḍa* containing a list of Vedic words which are synonyms, *Naigamakāṇḍa* or *Aikapadika* containing a list of ambiguous and difficult words and *Daivatakāṇḍa* containing a list of the names of deities occupying the sky, earth and heaven. A list of words called *Nirukta* was available to Yāska who wrote on it a commentary called also *Nirukta*.

Jyotiṣa arose as a supplement to serve the urgent needs of the sacrificers. The movements of the sun, moon and other planets and of the constellations were to be noticed.¹ In the light of their movements, was required to be fixed a day suitable for the performance of the sacred rites. To satisfy this want, calculations had to be made. It appears that lunar calculations were given more importance. References are found in the standard treatises to the lunar and solar astronomical calculations and to the intercalary month. A work called *Jyotiṣavedāṅga* of unknown authorship is now available. It has 43 verses attached to the *Yajurveda* and 36 verses attached to the *Rigveda*.

The origin of *Kalpa* is to be traced to the *Brāhmaṇa* portion of the *Vedas*. The treatises dealing with this subject are in the form of *Sūtras*, epigrammatic in form and understandable only with the aid of explanations. The long and tedious explanations, contained in the *Brāhmaṇas*, could not be remembered at the time of performance of the sacred rites. Hence the *sūtra* form was adopted for treating this subject.

This subject is broadly classified under four heads viz, *Śrauta*, *Grhya*, *Dharma* and *Sulva*. The *Śrauta sūtras* treat the worship of the three fires *dakṣiṇa*, *āhavanīya*, and *gārhapatya*, the performance of *darśapūrṇamāsa*, *soma* and other rites. The *Grhyasūtras* deal with all the popular customs and usages concerning a person from the time he is conceived in the womb of the mother till the hour of death. The major rites include the ceremonies connected with the birth of the child, initiation in the Vedic study (*upanayana*), the mode of life and duties of the members of the three castes, the Brahmins, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, in the two stages of the student of the *Vedas* and of the householder, the duties of a teacher, of a pupil, the marriage customs, the five sacrifices to be performed every day¹, house-building, cattle-breeding, magic rites to ward off diseases, funeral ceremonies and so on. In other words, these *sūtras* deal with all those rites connected with the life of a householder and which are to be performed by himself. The *Dharmasūtras* deal with law, religion, custom and usage, and the duties of castes and of the orders in life. The *Sulvasūtras* contain the rules for measuring and building the sacred altar. These represent a subject attached to the *Śrautasūtras*. They represent the beginnings of Indian geometry.

The *Śrauta* and the *Grhyasūtras* contain the rules for the conduct of the rituals and also for the use (*vinīyoga*) of the prayers and formulas in the performance of the sacred rites. Each *Kalpāsūtra* is attached to one *Veda* or the other. The *Mantrabrāhmaṇa* and the *Mantrapāṭha* are two works containing the collections of the *mantras* specially made as a supplement to the *Kalpasūtras* and be used for definite purposes respectively by the followers of the *Gobhitagrhyasūtras* and the *Āpastambagrhyasūtras*.

Bodhāyāna and Āpastamba, both of whom lived before 500 B. C., are the authors of the *Kalpasūtras* (*Śrauta*, *Grhya*, *Dharma* and *Sulva*) each in their own tradition. These *sūtras* are attached to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The *Grhya* and the *Śrauta*.

1. These are *brahmayajña*, teaching and studying the *Vedas*, *pitryajña*, offering libations of water to the manes, *daivayajña* offering oblations to the gods, *bhūtayajña*, giving oblations to all created beings, and *nryajña*, hospitality to the guests.

Vide :—अध्यापनं ब्रह्मयज्ञः, पितृयज्ञस्तु तर्पणम् ।

होमो देवो, बलिर्भूतो, दृयज्ञोऽतिथिपूजनम् ॥ *Manusmṛti* 3-70

sūtras of Satyāśāḍha Hiranyakeśin belong to an off-shoot of the *Taittirīya* recension. The *Dharmasūtras* of this author do not materially differ from those of Āpastamba. The *Agniveśagrhyasūtras*, the *Kalpasūtras* of the *Vadhūlas* and *Vaikhānasas*, are also attached to the *Taittirīya* recension. The *Mānava* school of the *Maitrāyaṇīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* has the *Śrauta*, *Grhya* and *Sulvasūtras*. To the same school are attached the *Kāthaka grhyasūtras*. The *Kalpasūtras* of Bharadvaja are also attached to the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*.

The other *Vedas* have only a few divisions of the *Kalpasūtras* attached to them. The *Rgveda* has the *Grhya* and the *Śrautasūtras* of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhyāyana and the *Grhyasūtras* of Sāmbhavya and Śaunaka. The *Suklayajurveda* has the *Śrauta* and the *Sulvasūtras* of Kātyāyana, and the *Grhyasūtras* of Pāraskara attached to the *Mādhyandina* recension. The *Sāmaveda* has the *Śrautasūtras* of Kātyāyana for the *Kautuma* recension and the *Śrautasūtras* of Drāhyāyana for the *Rāṇāyaṇīya* recension both being based on the *Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa*, the *Grhya* and the *Śrautasūtras* of Jaimini, the *Grhyasūtras* of Gobhila and the *Grhyasūtras* of Khādīra for the *Drāhyāyana* recension also used for the *Rāṇāyaṇīya* recension. In addition to these, attached to this *Veda* are the *Ārṣeyakalpa* also known as the *Maśakakalpasūtras* which contain an index of the hymns to be sung at the *Soma* sacrifice by the followers of the *Tāṇḍya* recension, the *Anupadasūtras* which comment on the *Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa*, the *Nidānasūtras* on the metres, the *Upagranthasūtras* on the performance of the sacrifices attached to the *Sāmaveda*, the *Kṣutrasūtras* on the ceremonial of the *Sāmaveda*, the *Tāṇḍalakṣanasūtras*, the *Kalpānupada*, the *Anustotrasūtras* and the *Grhyasūtras* of Drāhyāyana. The *Atharvaveda* has the *Vaitāna śrautasūtras* and the *Kausikasūtras* which treat the matter coming under *grhya* and also magic. Since this *Veda* has nothing to do directly with the rituals, it does not have the other divisions of the *sūtras* attached to it.

The *Grhyasūtras* are followed by the *Śrāddhakalpas* and *Pitrmedhasūtras* containing the rules for the rites connected with the manes. The *Mānavaśrāddhakalpa*, *Kātyāyanaśrāddhakalpa*, *Bodhāyanapitrmedhasūtra* and others come under his head. The *Paṇiṣṭas* or 'addenda' contain a more detailed treatment of certain topics of the rituals which have been dealt with briefly in the *Kalpasūtras*. The *Chāndogya* and the *Atharvapariṣiṣṭas* of Kātyāyana, the *Kṛatusaṅgraha*, the *Viniyoja aṅgraha* and the *Carananyūha* containing an exposition of the Vedic schools its authorship being ascribed to Śaunaka come under this head. The *Grhya ṅgrahapariṣiṣṭa* of Gobhilaputra and the *Karmaprañīṣa* are attached to the *Gobhila grhyasūtras*. The *Prāyaścitta sūtras* form part of the *Vaitāna sūtras* of the *Atharvaveda*. The *Praysga* which are 'practical hand books', and the *Paddhatis* which are 'outlines' and the *Kārikās* which are 'versified representations' form part of the *Kalpasūtras*.

The importance attached to these supplements is well brought out in the following stanza :—

छन्दः पादौ तु वेदस्य हस्तौ कव्योऽथ पठ्यते ।
ज्योतिषामयनं चक्षुर्निरुक्तं श्रोत्रमुच्यते ॥
शिक्षा घृणं तु वेदस्य मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम् ।
तस्मात्साङ्गमधीत्यैः ब्रह्मजोके महीयते ॥

(*Paṇinīyaśikā* ā 41 - 42).

Apart from these supplements, there are indexes called *Anukramanīs*. These contain the lists of the contents of the Vedic *Samhitās* with reference to the sages to whom the hymns are ascribed, the deities praised in the hymns, and the metres in which the hymns are composed. Śaunaka wrote for the *R̥gveda* the *Ārṣānukramanī* a list of the sages, *Chandonukramanī* a list of the metres, *Dera'nukramanī* a list of the deities, *Sūk'anukramanī* a list of the hymns, *Padānukramanī* a list of the words, *Anurākinukramanī* a list of the chapters, *Brhaddera'ā* a list of the gods together with the allusions to the accounts connected with them and *R̥gridhā* a list giving an account of the magic effects which could be procured by the recitation of particular hymns. From these indexes, the *R̥gveda* is known to contain 1017 hymns, 10580½ verses, 153826 words and 432000 syllables. The western critics hold that some among these were not written by Śaunaka, Kātyāyana, a pupil of Śaunaka, wrote the *Sarānukramanī* an index of all these in the form of aphorisms. This index belongs to the *R̥gveda*. To the same author is ascribed the authorship of the *Yajurvedānukramanī* of the *Vājasaneyīsamhitā* of the *Mādhyadina* recension. The *Ātreyaśikṣā*, and *Cārāyaṇīya* also called *Mantrarahasyādhyāya* belong to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The *Ātreyaśikṣā* contains an index to the *Samhitā*, *Brāhmaṇa* and *Āraṇyaka* portions. The *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa*, in spite of its title, is only an index to the *Sāmaveda*. The *Brhatsarvānukramanī* is the index to the *Samhitā* of the *Atharvaveda*. There are besides these, the supplementary treatises called the *Parīṣiṣṭas* which are twenty in number. All of them belong to the *Sāmaveda*.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EPICS—THE RĀMĀYAṆA

THE EPICS :—The period of the epics stands midway between the Vedic and the classical periods. This is evident from the features exhibited by the literature of this period. In the epics are found the archaic forms of words, the simple diction, the free use of the *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada* terminations of verbs and such other the features which are more akin to the language of the Vedic period than to that of the classical period.

The literature of the epic period represents the secular life of the ancient Hindus. This literature must have had its beginnings in the Vedic period itself. The words *ākhyāna*, *purāṇa* and *itihāsa* are found used in the Vedic texts. The tales of Purūravas and Urvasī, Sunahsepha and others represent, in the Vedic literature, the stage marking the beginning of epic writing. The term *itihāsa* is split up as *iti-ha-āsa* and means so indeed it was. The term, therefore, represents the account of an occurrence which took place long ago. The term *ākhyāna*, refers to the narration of an old story. The epics include within them a number of such '*ākhyānas*'.

Though secular in tone, the epics arose in religious surroundings. They were recited on the occasion of the performance of a sacred rite. The Vedic deities Savitr, Agni, Indra and others, who occupied a prominent position in the Vedic literature, come to occupy a subordinate position in the epics. Indra is still the lord of gods. Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra are pre-eminent in the epics. Kubera, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, Lakṣmī, Pārvatī, serpent-deities and other deities, who were insignificant in the Vedic period, occupy in the epic an eminent position. The form of the literature is changed. The Vedic period has the *Śmṛitā* of the *R̥gveda* in verse and that of others in prose. The epics are written in verse. A spirit of optimism, which fills the Vedic period, continues to be present in the epic in a diminished form. Cares and anxieties are found to increase without giving room for the rise of the spirit of optimism. The epics are further having descriptions on ascetics, their lives and the results achieved by them.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* are the two national epics of India. These contain a number of old stories thus proving the existence of the *Ākhyānas*, *Purāṇas*, *Itihāsas* which are allied to the epics prior to their writing. The superior excellence of these two epics totally eclipsed the literature of this type which existed in ancient India.

THE RĀMĀYANA

The *Rānāyāna* is the Indian epic containing 24000 stanzas distributed among seven sections (*Kāṇḍas*). It was composed by the sage Vālmiki. It deals with the life of Rāma and Sītā. The author calls it a poem¹, an *ākhyāna*², *gītā*³ and *saṁhitā*⁴.

Vālmiki was initiated into religious life by the seven sages. He meditated on God for a number of days without a break. When he got up from his penance he had to come out of an anthill which grew up around and on him. Hence he came to be called Vālmiki which name means one who had come out of the anthill (*valmika*). He was residing on the banks of the R. Gaṅgā near Ayodhyā. His was the first hermitage which Rāma visited on his exile⁵. He knew the important incidents in Rāma's life. He was attracted by his noble qualities. One day he happened to meet the sage Nārada who came there and desired to know from the latter about the life of an ideal man. The sage Nārada gave, in reply, an account of Rāma's life. From this, it appears that Vālmiki desired to get definite and authentic information concerning Rāma's life. After he left Nārada, his thoughts were centred on one person viz., Rāma and in this mood he proceeded to the R. *Tamasā* near his hermitage for ablution. On the way he saw a hunter strike a male bird which fell down dead. The female bird was overwhelmed with grief at this separation from its lover and began to cry bitterly. The sage Vālmiki, whose heart was filled with remorse at this sight, cursed the hunter to be unhappy for an indefinite period. His curse which was the result of his grief took the form of a verse which runs as follows :—

मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वमगमः शाश्वतीः समाः ।

यत्क्रौञ्चमिथुनादेकमवधीः काममोहितम् ॥

(*Rāmāyana*, *Bālakāṇḍa*. 2—15)

After attending to his duties in the river, he came back to his hermitage. The creator appeared before him and blessing him directed him to write on the life of Rāma after the manner of his expression of the curse. He gave the sage the power to have direct communion with Rāma's life, not only of the past but also of the future. After the departure of the creator, the sage began to compose a poem which came to be called *Rāmāyana*. The poem is in seven sections called the *Bā'la*, *Ayodhyā*, *Aranya*, *Kiṣkindhā*, *Sundara*,

1. *Rāmāyana*, *Bālakāṇḍa*, 2-41 ; *Yuddhakāṇḍa* 128-105.
2. *Rāmāyana*, *Bālakāṇḍa*, 4-32 , *Yuddhakāṇḍa* 128-118.
3. *Rāmāyana*, *Bālakāṇḍa*, 4-27.
4. *Rāmāyana*, *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, 128-120.
5. *Rāmāyana*, *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* canto 56.

Yuddha and *Uttarakāṇḍas*. He taught the poem to Kuśa and Lava, the twin sons of Sitā who was then living in his hermitage along with her sons. The epic was sung by the twins in the presence of Rāma on the occasion of the performance of the horse-sacrifice by Rāma.

The critics of the West and some Indian scholars in their following are of opinion that Vālmiki wrote from the latter half or preferably the end of the *Bālakāṇḍa* up to the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*. The remaining part of the epic was produced by some later writers and was put together with the original epic composed by the sage. This conclusion is arrived at on the following grounds :—

1. The present text of the epic contains the stories of R̥ṣyaśṛṅga, Viśvāmitra, Ahalyā, Rāvaṇa, Hanumān, descent of the R. Gaṅgā and others. These stories have no direct bearing on the main story. These are found in the first half of the *Bālakāṇḍa* and the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*. Such stories are not found in the epic in the portions other than these. The author of these stories must be some one different from Vālmiki who, with the object of writing the story of Rāma, would not have introduced these in the main portion. Therefore the parts of the epic containing these stories must have been written by some other writers.

2. The *Bālakāṇḍa* has two tables of contents one in the form of Nārada's account of Rāma's life and the other by some one which is given in canto 3. Nārada's account, which is also known as *Samkṣeparāmāyana*, does not include the contents of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. The other table of contents, however, has included them. On the strength of Nārada's account, Vālmiki would have written only up to the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*. The other table of contents must have been added by a later writer who prepared a table of contents for the entire epic finding the absence of reference to the events of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* in the *Samkṣeparāmāyana*. These tables of contents prove what Vālmiki wrote. Besides, the benedictory stanzas at the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* support this view.

Having proved thus that Vālmiki did not write the entire epic, the critics seek to put forward the motives for the later additions to the original composed by Vālmiki. (1) The stories of R̥ṣyaśṛṅga and others should have been added by later writers who desired that the *Rāmāyana* must contain a number of stories like the *Mahābhārata*. The biographical accounts of the characters of the epic were included in a separate book *Uttarakāṇḍa* (2). Vālmiki knew Rāma only as a man. When Kṛṣṇa became deified, an attempt was made to deify Rāma also. This was made by including certain passages necessary to support this deification. Such passages are found in the earlier part of the *Bālakāṇḍa* and in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* which were added at a later date. (3) The first stanza composed by Vālmiki was that

which came out as a result of his unbearable grief. The creator directed the sage to write his epic on the same model. The first stanza was composed in the *śloka* metre. The whole composition of Vālmiki must have been composed in the same metre. At a later date, when the definitions of the *Mahākāvya* required the poem to have the last stanza, in each canto, composed in a metre different from those in which the remaining portion of the canto is composed, the learned men of the day liked to have the name *Mahākāvya* given to the work of Vālmiki. With this end in view, a number of cantos and a number of stanzas were composed in different metres and were interpolated into the body of Vālmiki's work in the proper places. The work then came to acquire the name *Mahākāvya*. Since Vālmiki did not compose the stanzas in metres other than the *śloka*, he could not have written these portions which have been now shown as later additions.

This view of the critics requires careful consideration. The stories contained in the *Bālakāṇḍa* and in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* are mostly in the proper places. Those in the *Bālakāṇḍa* give a realistic picture of the events. The two princes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are told most of these stories which serve definite purposes in the context. No story is thrust in there for the mere pleasure of finding room for them. The stories of Viśvāmitra, of Rāvaṇa, Hanumān and others are also in the proper places. The persons, with whom these stories are connected, played a prominent part in the epic. Vālmiki did not give an account of their lives in the portion supposed to have been genuine. Without such accounts the epic could not be considered complete. An impartial study of the connections between the main theme and these stories reveals that the stories fit in with the context and that there is nothing unnatural in their inclusion in the epic. The absence of such stories, in the supposed genuine portion, must be due to the absence of the need for including there any such story. In this connection, it must be admitted that there had been interpolations particularly in the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. This point has the support of the Indian commentators who have plainly stated that certain cantos are spurious and have therefore not commented on them.

Regarding the second point, it is very clear that Nārada's account of Rāma's life is what Vālmiki listened to and that the table of contents in the third canto takes into account of what Vālmiki wrote. There is nothing to suggest that Vālmiki wrote only what he heard from Nārada and did not write anything beyond that. Moreover, the *Samkṣeparāmāyaṇa* has a reference to the future events in Rāma's life. It refers also to the horse-sacrifices which Rāma performed¹. Therefore there is no inconsistency in the *Bālakāṇḍa*

1, *Rāmāyaṇa, Bālakāṇḍa* 1—94, 95

which has two tables of contents. While the *Samkṣeparāmāyana* has references to the contents of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, the other table of contents makes a detailed reference to the events of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. The benedictory stanzas at the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* are there because those, who took to the daily recitation of the epic for gaining prosperity in this world; would have desired such stanzas to be at the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* which has an auspicious end. No one would desire to recite the epic up to the end of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* which has a tragic ending.

A study of the epic reveals that the first four cantos in the *Bālakāṇḍa* are introductory. The authorship of these four cantos cannot be fixed with certainty. More than one person could have written them. The disciples of Vālmiki, who were with him on these occasions, must have written them and prefixed them to the epic. From the introductory portion, it is learnt that the sage Vālmiki, after having composed the *Rāmāyana*, chose to train Kuśa and Lava in the singing of the epic. The twins should have been grown up boys. Sītā, therefore, must have been living in the hermitage of Vālmiki for a number of years. From the introduction, it does not seem that anything like a lengthy period of even one year has passed at the time he completed the epic from the time he met Nārada. It appears that after Sītā's exile by Rāma and her coming into his hermitage, the sage would have desired to record Rāma's life in a literary form. He must have wished to get the formal approval for such an undertaking from Nārada and therefore he approached Nārada.

If Vālmiki did not write the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, how did the author who is supposed to have written that portion get information about Rāma's life after his coronation? Vālmiki's poetry, which took its rise from grief, might have made him complete his epic with a tragic ending. For various reasons, Vālmiki is to be taken as the author of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* also. In the absence of this *kāṇḍa*, Bharata and Śatrughna would be reduced to the position of brothers, who distinguished themselves merely by their obedience but not by reason of their noble achievements in battles. In the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, it is stated that Bharata won the Gandharvas in battle and that Śatrughna killed the demon Lavana thus making his own name significant. If Vālmiki had not written this *kāṇḍa*, then he would have been accused to have been inefficient at characterization.

Moreover, there are three evidences which prove that Vālmiki wrote the *Uttarakāṇḍa* also. Numerous references to the contents of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* are found in the *Mahābharata* (3000 B. C.) *Dīnāga*, whose identity is difficult to be established, is the author

of the drama *Kundamālā*. He makes a reference in this play to Vālmiki's having stopped to write beyond Sītā's desertion by Rāma¹. Anandavardhana (850 A. D.) states definitely that Vālmiki wrote up to the separation of Rāma and Sītā. He writes,

रामायणे हि करुणो रसः स्वयमादिकविना सूत्रितः 'शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः'
इत्येवंवादिना । निर्व्यूढश्च स राव सीतात्यन्तवियोगपर्यन्तमेव स्वप्रबन्धमुपरचयता ।'

Dhvanyāloka, Chapter IV.

The evidence of Anandavardhana, in particular cannot be dismissed as baseless, for he, who possessed a high analytical faculty, would not have believed in a tradition if he had known it to be baseless. Therefore it will not be in the wrong if Vālmiki is recognised to have composed the entire epic.

As for the suggestions of the western critics regarding the later additions to the epic, it must be said that the stories were not added at a later date as in the case of the *Mahābhārata*, for the stories in the *Rāmāyana* are in the proper contexts while those in the *Mahābhārata* are not.

That Vālmiki did not treat Rāma as a god cannot be proved, for in India, poetry took its rise in religious surroundings. The religious spirit and the divine aspects of the situations gave a characteristic stamp to Indian poetry particularly in the earlier period. The text of the epic shows that Vālmiki believed in the divinity of Rāma. Granting that the supposed genuine portion of Vālmiki's epic does not contain any passage in support of the divine aspect of Rama, it appears absurd to recognise large portions of the epic as interpolations mainly because they contain a few passages referring to Rāma's divinity. Such passages are very few in number. It is possible to interpret the whole epic as a glorification of the divine aspect of Rāma. The treatment of this question depends on the attitude of the reader.

Regarding the features of the *Mahākāvya* exhibited by the epic which are shown to be due to the later additions of passages, it may be remarked that the critics of the west have tried to make a particular word yield a sense which it could not have possessed. The grief (śloka) of Vālmiki assumed the form of verse (śloka²). The critics of the west take the word 'śloka' here as the name of a metre. It is better to take it in the sense of 'what is put together'³ and the word is found used in the sense of a stanza¹. Indian commentators

1. *Diñnāga's Kundamālā* Act VI, 14.

2. *Rāmāyana*, *Bālakāṇḍa* 2-40 शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः ।

3. 'श्लोक' संघाते

have not suggested for this word the sense which the critics of the West have sought to ascribe to it. So it is preferable to hold that Vālmīki produced stanzas (ślokas) which were composed in the śloka metre and also in other metres. On the contrary, Vālmīki will have to be denied the authorship of beautiful stanzas which the epic contains in different metres. It does no credit to any scholar who would wish Vālmīki to be reduced to the position of a poet who could compose stanzas only in one metre. It is, however, possible that the features of the Mahākāvya in respect of the metres were not evolved when Vālmīki wrote the epic. The stanzas in different metres could have been composed at a later day and added at the end of each canto. On this ground, Vālmīki cannot be denied the authorship of the entire epic.

In this connection, it is interesting to refer to a passage² in the Bālakāṇḍa which states that the poet wrote the epic in 500 cantos consisting of 24000 stanzas. The text, which is now available, contains about 650 cantos and a little more than 24000 stanzas. The cantos, originally written by Vālmīki, must have been split up. Some of them must have been lost and some new ones interpolated. The same explanation holds good in the case of the stanzas. Some of the stanzas should have been misplaced. That there were interpolations is proved by the discrepancies in the order and number of the stanzas and cantos exhibited by the North, North-West and Bombay recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. There are some glaring cases of interpolations. While Rāma did not meet any civilised people in the regions to the south of the Vindhya mountains, there are references to the Pāṇḍyas, Colas, Āndhras, and Keralas and others. Such lines must have been added to make up the loss of some stanzas by the force of time. The references, to the teachings of the Buddha and Hanumān's study of the books on grammar some of which appear to be the works written at a later date, are to be treated as interpolations. Taking into account the oral tradition through which the epic was handed down, such interpolations of the cantos and stanzas are to be considered inevitable in a work like the *Rāmāyaṇa* which was written many thousands of years ago. Making allowances for the losses and additions of passages, it must be admitted that the sage Vālmīki wrote the whole of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The theories regarding the significance of the story of the Rāmāyaṇa :—

The scholars of the West contend that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is based on legends and myths. The events like the battle between men and demons, the crossing of the sea by a monkey and others are all

1. पचे यशसि च श्लोकः । Amarasimha's *Nāmlīṅgānuśāsana-kāṇḍa* 3, *Nānārthavarga* 2.

2. *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Bālakāṇḍa*, 4—2.

unreal and could not have taken place in any country at any time. As a result of this approach to the study of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the scholars of the West have set forth a number of theories on this topic.

Prof. Weber is the author of a theory which states that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is based on the *Daśārathajātaka*, a Buddhist version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and on Homer's *Illiad*. The facts, regarding this suggestion, are however different. The *Daśārathajātaka* is a Buddhist version of the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* without reference to the incidents which lead to Rāvaṇa's destruction. The purpose to be served by this *Jātaka* was to console a person who was grieved at the death of his father. The author of the *Jātaka* describes Rāma as unmoved by grief on hearing the death of his father. He did not continue the story because he did not see any purpose for it in the context. So this *Jātaka* was based on the *Rāmāyaṇa* and not vice-versa. The latter part of the theory is thoroughly baseless. Homer's *Illiad* could have become popular in India only after Alexander's invasion of India in 326 B. C., but the *Rāmāyaṇa* was popular even before that period. Thus this theory is entirely baseless.

Prof. Jacobi put forward a strange theory in which he drew a parallel between the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the Vṛtra incident in the *R̥gveda* and tried to prove that the Vṛtra incident is mythological and therefore is the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Vṛtra was a demon. He was an enemy of Indra. He carried away the cows of Indra and hid them beyond the seas. Saramā, a dog sent by Indra, traced the whereabouts of the cows and gave this information to Indra. Aided by the wind deities (Maruts), Indra attacked Vṛtra and killed him. Rāma stands for Indra. Sītā was born from the furrowed land (sītā). Indra, who is the lord of rain and who thus favours the furrowed land, has been made Rāma, the lord of Sītā. The name Indrajit of the son of Rāvaṇa is significant as it suggests the victor Vṛtra of Indra. Like Saramā, Hanumān went in search of Sītā. A reference to Hanumān's birth from the wind may be found in the wind-deities who helped Indra.

Mere coincidence between two events cannot decide that one of them must be based on the other nor does it mean that they are unreal. The parallel drawn in the present case is very striking. Vṛtra had the name Indrajit but the son of Rāvaṇa, who had that title for having vanquished Indra, would bear no comparison with Vṛtra, for while the cows were carried away by Vṛtra, Sītā was carried away not by Indrajit but by his father. The connection of Sītā with the furrowed land may appear understandable but not that of her abduction with the cows whose identity with the furrowed land cannot be established. The dog Saramā and the wind-deities

were distinct from each other. Hanumān and the monkeys all belonged to the same group. The word 'marut' as applied to the wind-deities cannot indicate, on the strength of Hanumān's connection with Marut, a connection in the events; for the monkeys, who helped Rāma, were not all of them the sons of wind. Such coincidences, as have been shown to exist, are possible in any literature. They may be accidental similarities and they do not prove that the events exhibiting such coincidences are either both or one among them unreal.

The results of the scientific investigations show that abnormal features in human beings or matter would manifest themselves owing to the influence of some exceptional properties on them. The archaeological findings prove that India had not only a glorious past but a life which goes back to numberless centuries. In the case of the demons mentioned in the *Rāmāyana*, probably there was abnormal growth of the body or they assumed hideous forms by the power of magic. It is not proper to treat them as unreal figures because they differed from the common man by having certain features which were unnatural.

Moreover, the epic story can be said to have two parts *viz.*, the events at the court of Daśaratha and their consequences. The events at Ayodhyā are quite natural and wherever polygamy prevails such state of affairs could not but be there. If the first part is real, the second part is also real. Since the *Rāmāyana* is an epic, it contains some elaborate descriptions which are poetical. Therefore the *Rāmāyana* is to be taken as an epic based on real events.

There are some other theories which may be mentioned here. Talboys Wheeler stated that the epic was only a poetic rendering of the conflict between Brahminism and Buddhism in the south. The untenability of this view is proved by the rise of Buddhism long after the epic was composed. The same writer suggested that the epic was based on the conquest of South India in the 13th century A. D. by the founders of the Vijayanagar empire. The absurdity of this statement is obvious on the strength of Indian chronology. Lassen held the view that the epic represented allegorically the first attempt of the Aryans to conquer the south. This view reveals an imperfect study of the epic which does not contain any reference to the finding of a realm in the south by Rāma. Another theory states that the *Rāmāyana* exhibits the progress of Aryan plough husbandry among the mountains and the forests of central and Southern India and the perils of the agricultural settlers from non ploughing nomadic hunting tribes. This statement ignores the fact that the epic does not anywhere refer to Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa as having proceeded to the south as agriculturists. Prof. Weber is responsible for one another theory

which states that the epic represents allegorically 'the spread of Aryan civilisation towards the south, more especially to Ceylon'.¹ Rāma's march, however, to the south is not described to have produced any change on any one in the south.

The date of the epic.

According to the Indian tradition, Rāma lived in the Tretāyuga which came to an end 867100 year before the birth of Christ. Vālmiki was a contemporary of Rāma. He wrote his epic while Rāma was ruling at Ayodhyā. Therefore the date of the epic is to be placed before the beginning of the Dvāparayuga i. e. before 867100 B. C. Such an ancient date is not reasonable, and justifiable to the critics of the West and the Indians in their line of thinking.

The critics hold that the central portion of the epic was available in a definite form before 500 B. C. The reasons adduced in this connection are :— (1) The *Mahābhārata*, which took a definite shape about the beginning of the Christian era and not before, contains references to the contents of the *Rāmāyana* and to its author. (2) Patna, which was founded by Kālāśoka who presided over the second Buddhist council at Vaiśālī in 380 B. C., is not mentioned in the epic *Rāmāyana*, while many towns like Kauśāmbī, Kānyakubja, Kāmpilya and others which lie to the east of Ayodhyā are mentioned. (3) Mithilā and Viśālā, which are mentioned as independent principalities in the epic, became grouped together under the name Vāiśālī which was ruled by an oligarchy during the days of the Buddha. (4) Sāketa came to denote Ayodhyā during the days of the growth of Buddhism. This word does not occur in the main portion of the epic. Similarly, Śrāvastī, which became the capital of Lava, the son of Rāma and which became the capital after the rise of Buddhism, is not mentioned in the main portion of the epic. (5) The kings during the period of the *Mahābhārata* had control over complex states while the kings, during the period of the *Rāmāyana* had control over small states. Therefore 'the original part of the *Rāmāyana* assumed shape at a time when the *Mahābhārata* was still in a state of flux'.²

This sort of reasoning is most unconvincing. The *Mahābhārata*, which was composed about 3100 B. C., knows the *Rāmāyana* of Vālmiki who is mentioned in it as a sage of by gone days. In connection with the numerous references which it contains about the *Rāmāyana*, it mentions the names of certain sages, in certain cases, as the narrators. These narrators could have given their own versions of the accounts of the life of Rāma which were available or known to them. Therefore the *Rāmāyana* must have been popular as an

1. Weber: History of Indian Literature P. 192

2. A. A. Macdonell; A History of Sanskrit Literature P. 302.

epic before 3100 B. C. The exact date of the composition of the epic however cannot be ascertained.

The Rāmāyaṇa as an epic and its popularity

The *Rāmāyaṇa* has become a popular book at the hands of the people of India. 'High and low, prince and peasant, nobleman, merchant and artisan, princesses and shepherdesses, all are quite familiar with the characters and stories of the great epic.'¹ It is a popular literary work and more than that, it is held in veneration by the Hindus. It is used for the daily recitation by the pious-minded. Since the writing of the poem, it has gained a fame which no other work has to its credit. Vālmīki predicted its prevalence as long as the mountains stand and the rivers flow.

Vide :—

यावत्स्थास्थन्ति गिरयः सरितश्च महीतले ।

तावद्भामायणकथा लोकेषु प्रचरिष्यति ॥

Rāmāyaṇa, Bālakāṇḍa—2-36-7

The prediction has been abundantly fulfilled.

The epic is called *Ādikāvya* and Vālmīki Ādikavi. The unique popularity of the work is because of the style, the author's power at characterisation and description and the innumerable memorable sayings which it contains. The style of Vālmīki is very simple, dignified, ornate and polished. The epic contains no word of rare occurrence. The simplicity of the style is heightened by the use of the words which are commonly used by the people. At the same time, it has a dignity of its own. It is embellished with the figures of speech. Upamā, Svabhāvokti and Rūpaka have been used to perfection only by Vālmīki. It is the only poem in which all the sentiments have found their legitimate share. It contains certain forms which would be treated as irregular in the light of Pāṇini's rules. Its language therefore represents the literary language of the *bhāṣā* of the pre-Pāṇiniyan period. The language in this epic has an effect on the hearer which is inexplicable, otherwise its continued popularity down to the present day cannot be accounted for.

Vālmīki's remarkable keen insight into the workings of the human heart is revealed in the vivid portrayal of the characters in the various situations. His success in this sphere is to a large extent due to the golden opportunity he was given to take up the life of Rāma for treatment. The noble qualities of the four princes of Ayodhyā and of the daughter of Janaka do not need here any mention, nor does the need arise in the case of those of the chief characters in Laṅkā and Kiṣkindhā. The poet has studied pretty

1. M. Winternitz : A History of Indian Literature Vol. I 476-77

well the mind of the three queens of Daśaratha. He draws a sharp contrast between them. He describes vividly the thoughts and behaviour of Kausalyā when Rāma takes leave of her and when she is by the side of Daśaratha in his last moments, of Sumitrā when she directs her son Lakṣmaṇa to follow Rāma and Sītā and of Kaikeyī, before and after she makes the demand of the boons and when she is disappointed at her son's refusal to take the throne which she got for him at an unbearably high price.

Equally unique is his power of description. His descriptions of the forest-sites, hermitages, armies, battles, palaces, towns, men and their ways are all realistic. His descriptions of the seasons produce on readers and hearers an effect profound and realistic not to be met with in any other work.

Innumerable are the wise sayings which fill the epic. They all teach men the path of material and spiritual progress. The unabated desire for property and sex mars the life of a person as evidenced by the careers of Kaikeyī and Vālin in the former case and by those of Daśaratha and Rāvaṇa in the latter. The poet lays stress on purity of conduct which alone is the outstanding virtue in the life of an individual. Marriage is a sacred trust and its sanctity is very well brought out. Above all these, it is proved that devotion to duty, in the light of these principles, elevates a person to glory.

The epic gives a vivid account of the state of society in ancient India. Democracy with the king at the head of the state was the system of government in Ayodhyā and Laṅkā. The policies of the government depended to a large extent on the will of the people. Steps were taken to prevent undue competition in trade and oppression of the weak by the mighty. There are references to engineering skill. The trees, which were uprooted on the way for purpose of constructions, were cleared with the help of machines. The religious rites were practised by the people at Ayodhyā. The demons, who created obstacles to the performances of such rites, chose to perform them whenever they needed them to gain their ends.¹ The standards of morality were observed strictly in Ayodhyā and were observed loosely in Kiṣkindhā. The epic refers to a mode of preserving the dead body from getting decomposed. The dead body was kept immersed in a cistern filled with oil.² There are references to surgical operations and some medical remedies³.

The epic has profoundly influenced the life of the people and also the poets of the classical period. The incidents, from the epic,

-
1. *Rāmāyaṇa Yuddhakāṇḍā* canto 85.
 2. „ *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* „ 66.
 3. „ *Sundarakāṇḍa* „ 28-6
Yuddhakāṇḍa „ 101-43.

have been cited for the purposes of illustrating the lessons of life. The epic has been responsible for moulding the character of the nation. The word Rāmarājya has come to mean benign rule. The story of Rāma attracts the people even in the form of translations. Its popularity is very well seen in the large audience attending the discourses on the epic. About the beginning of the Christian era, the epic became popular in foreign lands like Siam, Java, Sumatra, Bali and others. Inscriptions in these far-off lands tell that arrangements were made there for the daily recitation of the epic. In India, it has made a permanent impression on classical literature. The poets of the classical *Saṃskṛta* period derived their inspiration from the epic and took the themes from it for their compositions. It was translated into the Indian languages. The popular among them are the *Ram Charit Manas* written in Hindi by Tulsi Das in 1574 A. D. and the *Kamba Rāmāyaṇa* in Tamil by Kamban in the 13th Century A. D.

There are many commentaries on the epic. Most of them are of late origin. The important commentaries are the *Rāmāyaṇa-tattvadīpikā* of Maheśvaratīrtha, *Amṛtakataka* of Śrīrāma, *Dīpikā* of Vaidyanāthadīkṣita, *Tilaka* of Rāma, *Bhūṣaṇa* of Govindarāja of the 16th century A. D., and *Vālmīkihrdaya* of Ahobala of the same period. An exposition of the epic was made by Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A. D.) in his *Rāmāyaṇatātparyasaṅgraha* and by Tṛyambakamakhin (C. 1700 A. D.) in his *Dhārmākūta*.

CHAPTER IX

THE MAHABHARATA

The *Mahābhārata* is the other Indian epic. It was written by Vyāsa. It is the longest poem known to literary history. Its size is eight times the *Illiad* and *Odyessy* put together. It is divided into eighteen sections each section being called *parvan*. The eighteen *parvans* are :—*Ādi*, *Sabhā*, *Vana*, *Virāṭa*, *Udyoga*, *Bhīṣma*, *Droṇa*, *Karna*, *Śalya*, *Sauptika*, *Strī*, *Śānti*, *Anuśāsana*, *Āsvamedhika*, *Āśramavāsika*, *Mausala*, *Mahāprasthānika* and *Svargārohana*. Among these, the 12th *parvan* is the longest containing 14000 stanzas and the 17th is the shortest containing 312 stanzas. It has a supplement called *Harivaṁśa*. The epic together with the *Harivaṁśa* contains one lakh of verses.

The epic deals with the story of the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas. The story is too well-known and needs no narration here. Besides this story, the epic contains the accounts of gods, kings and sages which are not directly connected with the main story. There are accounts of cosmogony, theogony, expositions on philosophy, law, religion, duties of the castes and orders in life. In its final shape, it is a compendium teaching the four-fold aims of human existence. Owing to this aspect, the epic came to be called the fifth veda.

Vide :—

भारतः पञ्चमो वेदः ।

Vyāsa, who wrote the epic together with the *Harivaṁśa*, was originally called Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana as he was born in an island and was black in complexion. He was the son of the sage Parāśara. He was responsible for the arrangement of the Vedas into four divisions *R̥k.*, *Yajus*, *Sāma* and *Atharva*. Therefore he came to be called Vyāsa.

Vide :—

विश्यास वेदान् यस्मात्स तस्मात् व्यास इति स्मृतः ।

Mahābhārata, *Ādiparvan* 64—130.

He was a contemporary of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. He was an eye-witness to the incidents connected with their lives. He describes the characters with a truthfulness and vivacity that can be ascribed only to the evidence of an eye-witness. Sañjaya and others are introduced in the epic without any introduction as the author did not feel the need for it. The epic is thus based on his personal observation. The language of the epic is deep, simple and effective thus showing that it was a spoken language.

A study of the epic shows that it under-went changes at the hands of at least two editors. This is borne out by internal evidences. The epic itself contains a statement referring to the views about the actual portion in the epic which marked the beginning of the epic.

Vide :—

मन्वादि भारतं केचिदास्तिकादि तथापरे ।
तथोपरिचरादन्ये विप्राः सम्यगधीयिरे ॥

Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan 1—66.

Vyāsa composed, on the history of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, a work called *Jaya*. The author calls it an *itihāsa*.

Vide :—

जयो नामेतिहासोऽयं श्रोतव्यो विजिगीषुणा

Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan, 62—22.

He took three years to compose it. Probably it began with chapter 65 in the *Ādiparvan* in which the origin of the Kṣatriyas is given or chapter 64 which contains an account of the author's life. What he wrote was so overhauled by the later editors that it is not possible to mark out in the present text the portions he wrote. The work was written by Gaṇeśa, the son of Śiva. Vyāsa gave publicity to his work after the death of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. This work represents the first edition.

Janamejaya, the great grand son of Arjuna, performed a sacrifice to destroy the snakes with vengeance on them for the death of his father by snake bite. Vyāsa attended this sacrifice. At the request of Janamejaya who wanted to hear an account of the battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, Vyāsa called upon his pupil Vaiśampāyana to recite the *Jaya*. The epic was accordingly narrated. Janamejaya raised certain questions at the various stages of the narration. These were answered by Vaiśampāyana. His answers did not form part of Vyāsa's work. Probably they were his own versions or those of others which were already available to him. Vyāsa's work together with Vaiśampāyana's narrative accounts represents the second stage in the growth of the epic. The 61st chapter in the *Ādiparvan* may mark the beginning of his edition. This chapter contains a summary of the story of the epic narrated to Janamejaya by Vaiśampāyana. This version of Vaiśampāyana was called *Bhāratasamhitā*. It contains 24000 stanzas excluding the short narratives (*upākhyāna*). From this, it is possible to infer that Vyāsa's *Jaya* contained a little less than 24000 stanzas because Vaiśampāyana might not have added much to the *Jaya*.

Vyāsa had four other pupils called Jaimini, Paila, Sumantu and Suka. Each of them brought out their own versions of the *Jaya*. Except for an *Aśvamedhaparvan* by Jaimini, the versions of others are lost. This version of Jaimini describes the horse sacrifice performed by Yudhiṣṭhira.

Soon after the performance of Janamejaya's snake-sacrifice, Śaunaka a sage performed in the Naimiṣāranya a sacrifice which lasted for twelve years. This was attended by many sages among whom was Sauti, the son of Romaharṣaṇa. Sauti attended Janamejaya's sacrifice and listened to the narration of the epic by Vaiśampāyana. At the request of Śaunaka, he narrated the epic as recited by Vaiśampāyana together with the short narratives given by Vaiśampāyana. Sauti himself gave his own versions of certain matters during his narration. This narration of Sauti represents the third stage of the epic in its growth. This edition includes the *Harivaṃśa*. The epic assumed the extent of one lakh of stanzas at the hands of Sauti.¹ The first sixty chapters were prefixed by Sauti. Sauti gives a preface, an introduction and a table of contents as in the modern edition of a work. The first edition of the epic was divided into one hundred sections (*parvans*). Sauti made a careful division of the epic into eighteen larger sections. Each section in this edition has therefore a number of smaller sections.² This edition became huge and weighty. Hence it acquired the name *Mahābhārata*.

Vide :—

महत्वाद्भारवत्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्यते ।

Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan, 1—300.

Vaiśampāyana's narration of the epic, without the short narratives (*upākhyāna*), had 24000 stanzas. Sauti narrated the epic as recited by the second editor including the narratives. He added his own versions to the epic. His edition has one lakh of stanzas. Vaiśampāyana's version together with the short narratives could have had an extent almost approaching that of Sauti.

The present bulk of the epic could be easily accounted for on various grounds. (1) The epic was desired to contain matters on every topic.

Vide :—

यदिहास्ति तदन्यत्र यन्नेहास्ति न कुत्रचित् ।

Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan, 62—26.

Every available tale or passage treating the various topics was included into the epic. (2) The epic was desired to be a book on

1. *Mahābhārata, Ādiparvan, 1—127.*

2. " " 2—84-85.

law and duty. Every relevant account on these topics was included. (3) There are repetitions of certain stories. Probably, some chapters and some stanzas were lost in course of time. Attempts were made to make the loss good by the addition of fresh chapters and stanzas. These contained the accounts of stories which already existed in the epic. The stories of Yayāti, Vṛtra and others are to be mentioned in this connection. (4) Vālmiki's influence is felt in some poetic descriptions of nature and the lamentations of the women. Some of these descriptions might have been added later.

The Date of the epic :—

The battle between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas took place just before the beginning of the Kaliyuga. The date of the beginning of the Kaliyuga is placed in 3101 B. C. The epic might have been composed some years after the battle took place. The date of the *Jaya* must therefore be placed about 3100 B. C. The *Jaya* was recited on the occasion of the snake sacrifice performed by Janamejaya, the great grandson of Arjuna. Janamejaya may be taken to have lived about 3000 B. C. The date of the second edition may be placed in this period. Śaunaka performed the sacrifice soon after Janamejaya's sacrifice. Therefore Sauti's edition may be taken to have been available about the same period.

Internal evidences show that these were the dates. At the time of the commencement of the battle, all the planets are said to have come near the constellation Aśvinī. The date, which according to calculations would account for the occurrence of this phenomenon, is said to be 3101 B. C. Indian tradition believes in the contemporaneity of the Mahābhārata war and the beginning of the Kaliyuga. This is further supported by the evidence of Āryabhaṭa the Indian astronomer who lived in the beginning of the 6th century A. D.

Apart from these evidences, the records of Megasthenes place Heracles, identified with Kṛṣṇa, 138 generations prior to Sandrakottos who is identified with Chandragupta of the Maurya dynasty. Taking twenty years as the average duration of the period for each generations and taking Chandragupta's date to be 320 B. C., Kṛṣṇa may be said to have lived about 3080 B. C. which date agrees with that of the epic according to Indian tradition.

The western critics, who are reluctant to place a literary work at such a distant period, seek to prove that the epic assumed a definite shape about the beginning of the Christian era. The first edition must have been written after 3000 B. C., when the Aryans came into India. Till the beginning of the Christian era, portions continued to be added to it. Otherwise, the presence of certain passages in the epic could not be accounted for. For instance, the Yavanas and the Mlecchas, who are identified with the Greeks, are mentioned in the epic. This reference could have found room in the epic after 326 B. C.

The invasion of Sāketa by a Yavana is mentioned in the epic. This is a reference to the Greek invasion of Sāketa under Menander about 145 B. C. The Greek writer Rhetor Dion Chrysostom,¹ who lived in the 2nd half of the 1st century A. D., tells that the epic with its one lakh of stanzas was very well-known during his period in South India.

This view of the critics is not convincing, for the identity of the Yavanas and Mlecchas cannot be ascertained. India had contact with a number of foreign nations even before the advent of the Greeks. The words Yavanas and Mlecchas were used to denote foreigners in general. These references may therefore refer to any foreigner other than the Greeks who came to India long before 326 B. C. Other references are to be considered as interpolations made at a later date. Save these interpolations, the epic must have been available in 3000 B. C. and there is nothing to contradict this date for the epic.

A critical estimate of the Epic :—

The epic *Mahābhārata* is written in the form of verse with a few prose passages which prove their earlier origin by their style. The language of the epic is very simple and full of archaic forms. It appears to have been the spoken language or the *bhāṣa*. The style is not uniform probably because, the contributions to the epic, were made by Vyāsa, Vaiśampāyana, Sauti and many other unknown writers at different periods. Vālmiki's influence is felt in the words, phrases and descriptions of the epic.

The major portions of the epic are taken up by dialogues and narratives. The speeches are well-conceived, eloquent and forcible. The noteworthy feature of them is the fearlessness on the part of the speakers in expressing what they feel. They are vivid and realistic. The scenes describing the military test for the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, the life of the Pāṇḍavas in the forest during the period of their exile, the gambling scene and Karna's starting for the battle with Śalya contain some of the striking dialogues in the epic. The narratives particularly of the battles are all very realistic. The descriptions which it contains are realistic but decidedly inferior to those in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The author has relieved the monotony in the descriptions and narratives by putting them into the mouth of Sañjaya the charioteer who narrates them to Dhṛtarāṣṭra.

Vyāsa is very bold in characterisation. An air of independent spirit and an individual stamp are the outstanding features among the characters as they are portrayed by Vyāsa. He has shown how the mind of a person works in the hour of trials. The major men characters Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma, Arjuna, Nakula, Sahadeva, Duroyodhana, Vidura, Karna and others are all peculiar in their mental dispositions and behaviours. The paternal affection of the parents

1. Weber ; History of Indian Literature P. 186.

of Duryodhana and their sympathy for the oppressed Pāṇḍavas are studied side by side and the influence of one on the other is well brought out. Among the women characters, Kuntī and Draupadī occupy a prominent place. The former goads her sons to get back their legitimate share in the kingdom at all costs, for she does not bear the plight to which her sons were reduced. After Yudhiṣṭhira's coronation, she follows Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Gāndhārī to the forest. She speaks out her mind to her eldest son who pleads for her stay in the capital with him by telling why she induced him to wage a battle. She wishes to remain no longer with her son, since her object was gained.

Besides containing the main story, the epic contains short narratives, accounts didactic and ethical in spirit. Hence the epic is called a book on duty and law (*Dharmaśāstra*). It contains detailed accounts about the duties of kings, of men in the four castes and orders in life, of donors, of ascetics, of those who desire to get final release from worldly bondage and about those which are required to be performed in the hour of trials. All these are found scattered throughout the epic but are chiefly found in the *Sauti* and *Anuśāsana parvans*. The value of the epic is further heightened by its containing the famous *Bhagavadgīta*. The *Bhagavadgīta* gives in 18 chapters the discourse of Kṛṣṇa on law and duty which he delivered to Arjuna just before the war was begun. It contains vivid expositions on the nature of the individual souls, the Supreme Soul and matter, the duties of man, and the paths of progress both for material and spiritual ends. The epic occupies a prominent place in the historical development of the *Dharmaśāstra*. It is considered as the *Smṛti* of the Vaiṣṇavites, for (1) it is called the *Kārṣṇaveda*, a *Veda* connected with Kṛṣṇa, (2) its benedictory stanza is in praise¹ of Kṛṣṇa who is an incarnation of Viṣṇu (3) Bīṣma's discourses in the *Śān'iparvan* lend support to the religious beliefs of the Vaiṣṇavites and (4) Kṛṣṇa is present by the side of the Pāṇḍavas who come out victorious in the battle. Śaṅkara, the greatest exponent of the *Advaita* system of the *Vedānta*, speaks of the epic as a book on law. The inscriptions after the 5th century A. D. in and outside India, refer to the epic as an authoritative text for rewarding the donors and for punishing the wicked.

The literature of the classical period is greatly influenced by the epic. Kumārila, (600—660 A. D.) a great writer on the *Mīmāṃsā* system refers to and quotes from many parts of the epic. Bāṇa, the prose writer of the 7th century A. D. and Subandhu another prose writer of the 8th century A. D. have used the characters from the epic and the short stories which it contains for purposes of compari-

1. नारायणं नमस्कृत्य नरं चैव नरोत्तमम् ।
देवीं सरस्वतीं चैव ततो जयमुदीरयेत् ॥

sons and rhetorical embellishments in their works. Further, Bāna tells of the recitation of the epic in his Kādambārī. The inscriptions, dated 600 A. D. from Kamboja (Cambodia), show that the two epics were presented to the temples and arrangements were made for their daily recitation. This epic was translated in 996 A. D. into Javanese.

The epic throws abundant light on the state of society about the date of the epic. Parentage was honoured and the Brahmins were held in respect. Still, merit was considered as the sign of greatness. Karna, to all intents and purposes, was the son of a charioteer but his eminence as an archer was never underrated. The rules of the caste system were not in strict observance. Vidura, the son of a slave, was the acknowledged politician of the day. Drona was a Brahmin by birth but a Kṣatriya by profession. Dharmavyādha and Tulādhara, who were not of the Brahmin caste, were recognised as the authorities on duty and law. Despite the recognition given to the spirit of renunciation and the need for devotion to the Supreme Being and the gradual decline of the sacred rites in their importance, sacrifices and penances were continued to be performed. The sacrifices of Janamejaya Drupada, Yudhiṣṭhira and others and the penance of Arjuna prove this. The princes were given training in archery. Monarchy was the system of government. Gambling was considered a vice but was still practised. Svayamvara was the mode of choosing her husband by a bride and success in the test for archery qualified a prince as the worthy bridegroom. Polygamy was observed by the ruling class. The women used to cover their face with a veil. Following the husband on his death by entering the funeral pyre was practised by few women. There is little reference to the temples and idols. The regions to the south of the Vindhya were inhabited by civilised nations like the Colas, Pāṇḍyas, Ceras, Āndhras and others. Arjuna, in his expedition to the south, came to a village called Manalur on the banks of the R. Kāverī and married the daughter of a Pāṇḍya king. A Pāṇḍya king took part in the Mahābhārata battle on the side of the Pāṇḍavas. The Rājasūya sacrifice, which was performed by Yudhiṣṭhira, was attended by the kings from the south, from China, Persia and other foreign places. The Yavanas took part in the battle. The lac house was built by Purocana, a Mleccha at the order of Duryodhana. Thus the epic *Mahābhārata* contains valuable information about the life of the ancient Indians both in the religious and secular aspects. It is a poem, a *Dharmaśāstra* and a *Mokṣaśāstra*.

Harivamṣa is the supplement to the *Mahābhārata*. It was also written by Vyāsa. It contains about 16400 stanzas. It has three parts called *Harivamśaparvan* dealing with the ancestry of Kṛṣṇa, *Viṣṇuparvan* with Kṛṣṇa and his life and *Bhaviṣyaparvan* with the predictions of the future. It is also called *Harivamśapurāṇa*.

The short narratives (*upākhyāna*) in the epic are numerous. They form nearly fourfifth of the portion in the epic. Some of them are in

prose. Most among them appear, from their language, to be earlier in origin. The following are the prominent among them :—The stories of Gaṅgāvatarāṇa (and Descent of Ganga) Ṛṣyaśṛiga, Paraśurama, Cya-vana, Śibi, Rāma (son of Daśaratha), Sāvitrī, Nahuṣa, Tripurasamhāra, Śakuntalā Nala, Yayāti and Matsya. In the last mentioned narrative, the fish declares itself to be Brahmā the creator and not Viṣṇu.

The epic was commented by (1) Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, the earliest to comment on the epic. He lived in the 14th century A. D. His commentary is in fragments, (2) Arjunamiśra, who mentions Sarvajñanārāyaṇa and whose commentary appeared in print in the Calcutta edition of the epic in 1875 A. D. and (3) Nīlakaṇṭha, who lived in Kurpara in Maharāṣṭra in the 16th century A. D. His commentary is available in print. There are numerous other commentaries on the epic. There are criticisms of the epic by many Indian scholars. Ānandatīrtha's *Mahābhārata-tātparyanirṇaya* and Appayadikṣita's *Mahābhārata-tātparyasangraha* are the well known works among them.

The Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata as Epics :—

A study of the two epics reveals how closely they resemble in certain respects and how widely they differ in certain others. In form, the *Mahābhārata* appears to be earlier on account of the narratives in less polished style which it contains. Such narratives were not composed by Vyāsa but were available to him, composed by writers earlier to him. The *Mahābhārata* is divided into *adhyāyas* while the *Rāmāyaṇa* is divided into cantos. In its final shape, the former is only a group of various topics all of them being brought together in the epic while the latter has a unity about it and is complete in itself. In point of style, the former has no uniformity but has direct appeal, simplicity and vigour. The latter has a chaste and polished style which has a dignity of its own.

While the *Rāmāyaṇa* has no reference to the story of the *Mahābhārata* the latter contains numerous references to the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and to Vālmīki and shows traces of having been influenced by the epic of Vālmīki.

Both the epics show a similarity in the treatment of the theme. Both begin with a court scene followed by a period of exile for almost the same duration. The exiled parties win the friendship of the chief of a town which they visit. Then there are battle-scenes. Both the epics end in tragedy. Both have the same aim 'Vice may rise for a time but ultimate success crowns the head of virtue'. The authors of the epics were the contemporaries of the heroes in them and were connected with them. The epics were recited by the pupils of their authors on the occasion of a sacrificial session.

While the *Rāmāyaṇa* has only one hero, the *Mahābhārata* has many laying equal claim for prominence. The characters in the

former lived up to the high principles which were preached in the latter to be followed by the reactionary characters. The strict idea of morality as evidenced by Sītā's fire-ordeal is remembered in the latter epic but was not put to practice. The rigid observance of the rules of the caste-systems prevailed when Vālmīki wrote his epic while it became relaxed in the days of Vyāsa. The philosophic and religious aspects of life have in the former a purely Brahminical colouring laying stress on the divinity of Rāma while in the latter they represent the various aspects of Hinduism like monotheism, polytheism, spiritualism and materialism.

The test for archery on the occasion of the *Svayamvara* is simple in the *Rāmāyana* while that in the *Māhābhārata* shows marked improvement over that in the former. While the monkeys and the demons with their experience in magic feats took part in the battle in Vālmīki's epic, only human beings, except Ghaṭotkaca, played their part in the *Mahābhārata* battle. The former epic does not know the modes of warfare of the latter epic like *Krauñcavyūha*, *Makaravyūha*, *Śyēnavyūha*, *Padmavyūha* and other formations of the army. The former contains no reference to the practice of *Sati* while the latter has. The influence of the foreigners is felt in the latter and not on the former. The former does not refer to any foreign country except *Laṅkā* while the latter refers to many nations. The former knows South India as a region haunted by wild beasts with a few hermitages while the latter knows it as a region populated by civilised people.

Both the epics are native in origin. They have profoundly influenced the life of the Indians for ages. The poets of the classical period look upon them as the fountain-source for inspiration.

CHAPTER X

THE PURĀṆAS

The word 'Purāṇa' refers to stories of ancient origin. The name *Purāṇa* as applied to them shows definitely their existence from a long time. This word occurs in the Vedic literature along with the words *itihāsa* and *ākhyāna*. The accounts about the origin of the world, and the lives of heroes, warriors, ascetics and others could have been composed in the Vedic period. These came to be called the *Purāṇas*. In most cases, the authors are not remembered. The *Mahābhārata* contains references to them. The last section in this epic contains a reference to the number of the *Purāṇas*. The *Hari-vamśa* also makes a similar reference to them. It is also said that Vyāsa studied the *Purāṇas* and then composed his *Jaya*. Some of the *Purāṇas*, which contain these short narratives, refer to the *Mahābhārata*. Such narratives must have been composed after the epic was written. Apart from the *Mahābhārata*, the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama and Āpastamba, which were written about 500 B. C., refer to the existence of the *Purāṇas*.

The date of this literature cannot, however, be ascertained with definiteness. Some of the passages, which these *Purāṇas* contain, are very old while some are of very late origin. The *Purāṇas*, which give genealogical accounts of the ruling classes, do not mention King Harṣa and others who flourished after 600 A. D. It is therefore possible to fix 5th century A. D. as the period before which the *Purāṇas* should have assumed a definite and permanent shape.

A *Purāṇa*, according to the Indian tradition, must treat five topics viz , the creation of the universe, its destruction, the genealogies of gods, the ages of Manus and the history of the solar and lunar races.

Vide :—

सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।
सर्वेष्वेतेषु कथ्यन्ते वंशानुचरितं च यत् ॥

Viṣṇupurāṇa 3-6-24.

This definition must have been framed at a stage when the *Purāṇas*, which were then available, exhibited these features. After this stage, a number of topics, unconnected with those mentioned in this definition, were introduced into almost all the *Purāṇas*. Except the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* which satisfies these conditions, all the *Purāṇas* treat with descriptions, of the earth, prayers, fastings, festivals pilgrimages and so on. Some of them deal with astronomy, anatomy, medicine, grammar, use of weapons and all such topics.

The main contribution of the *Purāṇas* is its invaluable support for theism. They have, however, to deal with a number of gods. They declare all the gods to be equal and at the same time they glorify one particular god. The worship of a particular deity is recommended but that of another is not prohibited. Thus they enjoin the exclusive worship of a deity but prohibit the preferential worship of that deity. The religion of the *Purāṇas* can be said to be polytheistic yet pantheistic.

The *Purāṇas* are very valuable as they contain evidences with which the ancient history of India could be reconstructed. They deal with the dynasties like those of Śiśunāgas, Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, Āndhras, Guptas and others. Making allowances for slight differences in the duration of the periods given to each dynasty in these, it is possible to arrive, with a fair degree of accuracy, at the dates and the duration of these dynasties. The accounts of the royal dynasties, which these *Purāṇas* contain, have not received, so far, due attention at the hands of the Western critics who have been treating, as forming part of history, what is liking to their taste among them and condemning, as mythology, what they do not like. Really speaking, what the *Purāṇas* contain must be treated as historical facts.

The Indian tradition ascribes the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* to the authorship of Parāśara, the father of Vyāsa, who wrote the *Jaya* and the seventeen other *Purāṇas* to that of Vyāsa. The eighteen *Purāṇas* are :— (1) *Brahmāṇḍa* (2) *Brahmavaivarta* (3) *Mārkaṇḍeya* (4) *Bhaviṣya* (5) *Vāmana* (6) *Brahma* (7) *Viṣṇu* (8) *Nārada* (9) *Bhāgavata* (10) *Garuḍa* (11) *Padma* (12) *Varāha* (13) *Matsya* (14) *Kūrma* (15) *Liṅga* (16) *Śiva* (17) *Skanda* and (18) *Agni*. The *Purāṇas* themselves contain this list. In some lists, the *Vāyupurāṇa* is included in the place of the *Śivapurāṇa*. The *Purāṇas* give evidences regarding their authorship. It is said that Vyāsa had before him a number of *Purāṇas* which were composed by early writers. He was responsible only for giving them publicity. Another version tells that he wrote only one *Purāṇa* i. e. the *Brahmpurāṇa*, while his pupils wrote the others. It is also said that Vyāsa wrote a summary of the 18 *Purāṇas*. A passage from the *Śivapurāṇa* tells that the *Padma* and *Brahmapurāṇas* were written by Brahmā, and *Śivapurāṇa* by Śailālin. The *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* tells that all the *Purāṇas* put together contained 12000 stanzas. It is better to assume that Vyāsa wrote 18 *Purāṇas* which were the summaries of the *Purāṇas* he had before him. After him, the literature of the type of the *Purāṇas*, which did not get included anywhere, was included in the *Purāṇas* without any reference to the proper context. That is why, the *Purāṇas* as they are available, do not give any definite information on any topic. In this connection, it may be

noted that Śaṅkara did not cite any passage from any of these *Purāṇas* except the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. From this, it is possible to hold that although the other *Purāṇas* could have existed before 600 A. D., they were not treated authoritative. It is only from the time of Rāmānuja that these *Purāṇas* came to be treated as authoritative texts.

The *Purāṇas* are in the form of conversation between two or more different persons and in this respect, they resemble the *Mahābhārata*,

The *Purāṇas* are didactic in character and sectarian in purpose. They contain useful information on morals and duty which are given in the form of instructions. The aim of them is however different. Invariably they uphold the views of one religious sect or other. With this object in view they have been classified as *Sāttvika*, *Rājasa* and *Tāmasa*. The *Viṣṇu*, *Nārada*, *Bhāgavata*, *Garuḍa*, *Padma* and *Varāha* are the six *Sāttvika Purāṇas* which are dedicated to Viṣṇu. The *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Brahmavaivarta*, *Mārkaṇḍeya*, *Bhaviṣya*, *Vāmana* and *Brahma* are the six *Rājasapurāṇas* which are dedicated to *Brahmā*. The *Matsya*, *Kūrma*, *Liṅga*, *Śiva*, *Skanda* and *Agni* are the six *Tāmasapurāṇas* which are dedicated to Śiva. The classification was made with the view that each deity in the Hindu trinity is to be dedicated equal number of the *Purāṇas*. Some of the *Purāṇas*, although dedicated to a particular god, are not sectarian in purpose. The *Mārkaṇḍeya* and *Bhaviṣya* are in the least sectarian. The *Brahmapurāṇa*, which is dedicated to *Brahmā*, glorifies other gods like the sun. This classification is therefore not final.

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* was written by Parāśara. It glorifies Viṣṇu by describing his incarnation but does not refer to any fasting or ceremony observed by the devotees of Viṣṇu nor does it make a reference to the temples of Viṣṇu. It describes the Maurya dynasty. It is the only *Purāṇa* which conforms strictly to the definition of a *Purāṇa*. The *Nārada* also called *Brahannārādīya* contains descriptions of feasts and ceremonies. Salvation is to be acquired, according to this *Purāṇa*, through meditation and devotion to gods. The *Bhāgavata* describes the life of Kṛṣṇa. It contains 18000 stanzas grouped under 12 sections called the *skandhas*. The tenth section, which deals with Kṛṣṇa's exploits, is the most popular. This *Purāṇa* has many translations in the Indian languages and has commentaries, Gautama Buddha and the Sage Kapila are mentioned as the incarnations of Viṣṇu. This work bears the stamp of a unified composition. Its style approaches to that of the Vedic period in some places and that of the classical period in others. Among not *Purāṇas*, it is the most popular. Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja have not cited any lines from this *Purāṇa*. It does not mean that on account of this evidence that the *Purāṇa* could not have existed about 700 A. D. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, which was looked upon as a standard text,

served the purpose for these two philosophers. Therefore, they could not have cared for the other *Purāṇas* which gave the same information as the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* did. Ānandatīrtha is the earliest writer to cite passages from these *Purāṇas* and to comment on the *Bhāgavata*. *Harilīlā* is an index to the *Bhāgavata* by Vopadeva (13th century A. D.).

The *Garuḍapurāṇa* deals with astronomy, astrology, medicine, grammar, the nature and value of precious stones, and such other topics which are unconnected with the aim and purpose of the *Purāṇas*. The *Padmapurāṇa* is in six sections called *Ādikhaṇḍa*, *Bhūmikhaṇḍa*, *Pātālakhaṇḍa*, *Sṛṅgikhaṇḍa* and *Uttarakhaṇḍa*. The *Purāṇa* is called after the word 'Padma' which refers to the lotus from which Brahmā sprang. Rādhā, to whom neither the Viṣṇu nor the Bhāgavata makes a reference, is mentioned here as the consort of Kṛṣṇa. Among other stories, it contains the stories of Śakuntalā and Rāma. These stories agree in their contents more with the themes in the *Śākuntala* and *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa than with the corresponding stories in the epics. The opinion among the critics is that these portions in the *Purāṇa* must have been written after the period of Kālidāsa. The *Varāhapurāṇa*, besides describing Viṣṇu's incarnation as the boar, gives an account of the prayers addressed to Mother Earth treated as a goddess.

The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* is more a collection of the narratives (*upākhyāna*) and the merits of the holy places (*māhātmya*) than a *Purāṇa*. It contains *Adhyātmamāyana* in seven books. Having the external form of an epic in which Pārvatī and Śiva take part in conversation, it teaches that *Advaita* and devotion to Rāma are the paths leading to salvation. The *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, as the term *vaivarta* suggests, holds that all creations are only the illusory forms of the Brahman. It has four books *Brahmakhaṇḍa*, *Prakṛtikhaṇḍa*, *Gaṇeśakhaṇḍa* and *Kṛṣṇajanmakhaṇḍa*. At Kṛṣṇa's order, the matter (*Prakṛti*) changed into Durgā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī and Rādhā. Gaṇeśa, the son of Śiva, is mentioned as an incarnation of Kṛṣṇa. The *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* gives prominence to Indra, Brahmā, Agni and Sūrya. It gives answers to some of the questions which were raised on the conduct of the characters of the *Mahābhārata*. It contains the *Devīmāhātmya* glorifying Goddess Durgā. The *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* contains prophecies of the future. It deals with the duties of the castes and worship of the sun, fire and the snake. The *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa*, a handbook of religious rites, is only a continuation of this *Purāṇa*. The *Vāmanapurāṇa* describes Viṣṇu's incarnation as the dwarf. It deals with the worship of the liṅga. The marriage of Pārvatī and Śiva is described. The *Brahmapurāṇa* is also called *Ādipurāṇa* and is supposed to have been written at first by Vyāsa. It glorifies the sacred places in Ondhradesa (modern Orissa). Śiva is identified with the sun who is glorified. It has a supplement

called the *Saurapurāṇa*. There is a reference in this *Purāṇa* to the temple of the sun built after 1241 A. D. at Konarka near Puri.

The *Matsyapurāṇa* deals with festivals, sacred places, omens, and the rites observed by the Śaivites and Vaiṣnavites. It contains references to South India, *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Jainism, Buddhism, *Narasimha* and other secondary *Purāṇas* and to the Āndhra dynasty. It gives accounts of house-building, South Indian architecture and iconography. The *Kūrmapurāṇa*, which had formerly four *Samhitās*, now has only one called the *Brāhmīsamhitā* in 6000 stanzas. It deals with the incarnations of Śiva. It contains within it the *Īśvara-gītā* and *Vyāsagītā* which recommend meditation and duty as the means to get knowledge. The *Līṅgapurāṇa* describes the 28 incarnations of Śiva and is ritualistic in character. The *Śivapurāṇa* is considered to form part of a bigger one *Vāyu* by name. It is in 12000 stanzas. It is quoted in the *Mahābhārata* and *Harivaṃśa*. The poet Bāṇa (600 A. D.) refers to the recitation of the *Vāyupurāṇa* in his village. It has no reference to Buddhism and Jainism. It refers to the Gupta rule. It has a chapter on music. The major portions of this *Purāṇa* are considered to have been composed before 500 B. C. The *Skandapurāṇa* has six *Samhitās* called *Sanatkumārīya*, *Brāhmī*, *Vaiṣṇavī*, *Śaṅkara* also called *Agastya*, and *Saura*. Apart from these, it has fifty sub-sections called *Kāśīkhaṇḍa* describing the temples in and near Benares. Among these, the *Sūtasamhitā* is very popular. It deals with the worship of Śiva. *Mādhavācārya* (circa 1350 A. D.) wrote a commentary on it called *Tātparyadīpkā*. The whole *Purāṇa* contains more than 80000 stanzas. The *Agnipurāṇa* is encyclopædic in treatment and is communicated by Agnī to Vasiṣṭha.

The *Devībhāgavata* is also considered as one of these *Purāṇas*. It takes the place of the *Bhāgavata* in the list of the *Purāṇas*. It is in praise of Devī, consort of Śiva. The *Yogavāsistha* is a philosophical work in six sections called *prakaraṇas* and has the form of a *Purāṇa*.

Apart from these eighteen *Purāṇas*, there are eighteen *Upapurāṇas*. All of them are ascribed to Vyāsa. They have more of the ritualistic element than that of the epics. Some among them have the same names like the main *Purāṇas*. Among them the *Kālikā-purāṇa* deserves mention here. It describes Kālī in her various forms and deals with animal and human sacrifices to be offered to her.

There are some other works with the form of the *Purāṇas* but not included in the list. Among them, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* deals with Kashmirian Vaiṣnavism, the *Nīlamatapurāṇa*, which contains the doctrines preached by King Nīla, the cultural hero of the Nāgas in

Kashmir, gives an account of the history of Kashmir and the *Brhaddharmapurāṇa* declares Kapila, Vālmīki, Vyasa and Buddha as the incarnations of Viṣṇu. The genealogies of Nepal, which are partly Buddhistic, are the off-shoots of the *Paurāṇic* literature.

CHAPTER XI

THE KĀVA PERIOD—PRE-KĀLIDĀSA PERIOD

The period of the Kāvya literature is closely connected with that of the epics. The term '*Kāvya*' means anything produced by a poet. It includes poems, prose, fables, tales, lyrics, dramas and others. Still, its use is narrowed down to the poems although its use with reference to other types is not forbidden.

Paucity of information about poets and their works acts as a positive hindrance in establishing the identity of the poets. This has made possible the attribution of a number of works of varying excellence to a reputed poet for the reason that the authors of many among them are not known. It is possible to guess why the authorship of certain works cannot be determined. During this period, a work was allowed to flourish only on the approval of it by eminent critics. The works which were not approved by them were allowed to be lost and forgotten. Therefore what was easily the best in each branch of literature was allowed to remain. This resulted in the loss of some works and in the attempt of a poet of average ability to write his composition and to allow it to pass under the names of the poets of repute and thus escape condemnation at the hands of the fastidious critics.

The poems, written during this period, had to conform to certain restrictions imposed on the poets by the rhetoricians. The *Mahākāvya*, the best known type of the poems, is to begin with a benediction, or with the theme proper. It is to be divided into cantos, the last stanza in each canto composed in a metre different from those in which the remaining part of the canto is composed. It must deal with the descriptions of cities, seas, mountains, seasons, the rising and setting of the sun and moon, marriages, battles, love in separation, drinking parties and so on. A poet may take some of these features and give them in his poem a good treatment.

The period before Kālidāsa is a dark one. The variety of metres skilfully handled by him, and the figures of speech which beautify his works show that before Kālidāsa, the *Kāvya* literature was in a flourishing condition and became perfected at the hands of Kālidāsa. Among his predecessors, Vālmīki, proudly and justly called the *Ādikavi*, was the father of poetry and his epic the *Rāmāyana*, the *Ādikāvya* has continued to exist. It is possible that all other poems were written on the model of the epic of Vālmīki. The definition of the *Mahākāvya* is based on the features exhibited by the epic. Pāṇini, the grammarian, is known from the anthologies to have been the author of a poem *Pātālavijaya*. From Patañjali, it is learnt that

Vararuci, identical with Kātyāyana, wrote a poem. Piṅgla also called Piṅgalanāga wrote the *Chandaḥsūtra* on metres. He is to be placed at the end of the Vedic period. His metres stand midway between the Vedic and the classical periods. The names of the metres treated by him are identical with the names of the women whom the author describes in the stanzas which give the definitions and illustrations. *Cañcalākṣikā*, *Kuṭilagati* and others are the names of the metres. From this, it becomes clear that before Kālidāsa, the *Kāvya* literature was in a flourishing condition. The superior charm and excellence of Kālidāsa's works eclipsed the poems of his predecessors.

CHAPTER XII

THE KĀVYA LITERATURE—KĀLIDĀSA

About Kālidāsa, the prince among the Samskr̥ta poets, nothing is known. Many stories have gained currency about his life. One among them makes him a born idiot who was married to a princess accomplished in arts. At her suggestion, he propitiated Goddess Kālī and got poetic talents from her. Then he composed his works. Another story connects him with a King Kumāradāsa of Ceylon and his death in Ceylon, while on a visit there, at the hands of a courtesan, who was avaricious of the valuable presents which the poet was to be awarded for his talents by King Kumaradāsa (C. 500 A. D.). One another theory makes him a poet under King Bhoja of Dhārā and narrates the poet's activities in his court. All these theories and stories are to be treated as far removed from truth since chronological difficulties come in the way of accepting them as genuine. They could also be considered as the productions of some admirers of Kālidāsa. Kālidāsa must have been mistaken for Parimala, also known as Padmagupta who was patronised by king Bhoja of Dhārā (1005—1054 A. D.) and was awarded the title Kālidāsa or Parimalakālidāsa for his elegant style which was in imitation of Kālidāsa's. The confusion between the names of the two poets probably gave rise to the theory which connected Kālidāsa to the court of King Bhoja.

There is no direct evidence either external or internal to fix the date of Kālidāsa. He must have, however, lived before 472 A. D., which is the date of an inscription, written by Vatsabhaṭṭi whose language in the inscription shows traces of the influence of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandēśa*. Bāṇa (C. 600 A. D.) refers to Kālidāsa's graceful style. Kālidāsa is mentioned in the Aihole inscription dated 634 A. D. The date of Kālidāsa cannot therefore be later than 400 A. D.

There is a tradition which makes Kālidāsa a poet in the court of a king Vikramāditya. It is based on the evidence of a verse contained in the *Jyotiṣśāstra* an astronomical work of recent origin. The verse runs thus :—

धन्वन्तरिक्षपणकामरसिंहशङ्कु—

वेतालमृगटकपर्करकालिदासाः ।

ख्यातो वराहमिहिरो नृपतेः सभायां

रत्नानि वै वररुचिर्नव विक्रमस्य ॥

According to this verse, Dhanvantari, Kṣapaṇaka, Amarasimha, Śaṅku, Vetālabhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira and

Vararuci were the nine gems in the court of King Vikramāditya. Among these, Kṣapanaka, Śaṅku and Vetālabhaṭṭa are mere names to us. Identity of Dhanvantari, Vararuci and Ghaṭakarpāra is not established. Amarasimha is known as the author of the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanī*. His date is not ascertained but he must have lived between 400 and 600 A. D. Varāhmihira was the astronomer who died in 587 A. D. This verse cannot, therefore, prove the nine persons to have been contemporaries. It proves only that Kālidāsa was a poet under a king Vikramāditya, whose identity it is very hard to establish.

Many theories were suggested regarding the date of Kālidāsa on the strength of this verse from the *Jyotiṛvidābharaṇa*. Attempts were made to connect Kālidāsa with kings who had the title Vikramāditya. There were, at least, four kings who bore this title. They were King Vikramāditya who ruled at Ujjain and founded the Vikrama Saṃvat era in 56 B. C., Chandragupta II (357—413 A. D.), and Kumāragupta I (413—455 A. D.) and King Vikramāditya of Kāshmir (circa 500 A. D.). The Indian tradition connects Kālidāsa with the king who flourished in the pre-Christian era. The critics of the West treat this king as a legendary figure. The existence of a king with this title in the pre-Christian era is proved beyond doubt by a reference to a king Vikrama in the *Gāthāsaptāśatī* of Sātavāhana who lived in the 1st century A. D.¹ and by the use of the Saṃvat era. The Western critics connect Kālidāsa with the two Gupta Emperors Chandragupta II and Kumaragupta I. Thus there are two prominent theories about the date of Kālidāsa.

Some scholars made attempts to place Kālidāsa about 400 A. D. or about 500 A. D. on the strength of certain evidences which were based on the works of Kālidāsa. They take the word *diñnāgānām*² used by Kālidāsa as a reference to the Buddhist logician Diñnāga (C. 400 A. D.) whom, they suppose to have been an opponent of Kālidāsa. On the strength of this, they seek to place Kālidāsa about this period. This evidence is thoroughly unconvincing. It is not shown why there should have been opposition between Kālidāsa a Hindu poet and Diñnāga a Buddhist philosopher. Some Indian writers find a reference in this word *diñnāgānām* to the Hindu poet Diñnāga who wrote the play Kundamālā. His name is also read as Dhīranāga. This gives some difficulty in identifying the author of this play. From the style of the play, Diñnāga, if he had been the author of this play, deserves the credit for having been the worthy opponent of Kālidāsa. But no reliance could be placed on this word for want of sufficient evidence to come to a decision. It is better to take the word in the sense of the elephants of the quarters.

1. Sātavāhana : *Gāthāsaptāśatī* VI 54.

2. Kālidāsa : *Meghaśandēśa Purva* 14.

Some critics of the West place Kālidāsa about 500 A. D. on the strength of a word *jāmitra* used by Kālidāsa¹. This word, which is similar to the word *diametron* of Greek origin, is said to have been borrowed by Kālidāsa from Āryabhaṭa (C. 500 A. D.) the earliest Indian astronomer to make use of the Greek astronomical terms. These critics, who recognise the use of similar terms of Greek origin in the works of Aśvaghoṣa (C. 100 A. D.), hesitate to admit the use of those words by Kālidāsa at a period before 500 A. D. This only reveals the pronounced bias of these critics. The fact about the origin and use of these terms is that they were used by Bodhayana (C. 500 B. C.) in his *Gr̥hyasūtra* and that they did not owe anything to the Greeks. Hence this evidence is of no value in fixing the date of Kālidāsa who might have lived at any time after 500 B. C.

The critics of the West attempt to show that Kālidāsa was patronised by the Gupta Emperors who had the title Vikramāditya. They are known, from the inscriptions, as patrons of learning. The name Kumāragupta for one of these kings and their title Vikramāditya account for the titles *Kumārasambhava* and *Vikramorvaśīya* for the compositions of the poet. The description of the victorious march of Raghu was modelled by Kālidāsa on that of Samudragupta (C. 350 A. D.) with which the memories of the people, who lived during the time of Kālidāsa, were still fresh. Raghu's defeat of the Huns reminds that of Skandagupta (455 A. D.).

The attempts of these critics to connect Kālidāsa with the Gupta rulers are entirely baseless. The critics hold that the Gupta rulers were responsible for the revival of the Saṃskṛta learning and were patrons of poets and their periods mark the Golden Age in the history of India. But, India does not remember the Gupta rulers in connection with learning. It is Kings Vikramāditya and Bhoja that are cherished in the memory of the Indians. The opposite view cannot hold good in this connection, for the Indians know more intimately about the patrons of learning than the Western critics of the present generation. The Guptas would have lived in the memory of the people had they been great patrons of learning like Vikramāditya and Bhoja. This Gupta theory with reference to Kālidāsa's date is therefore an invented one by the ingenious critics.

The evidences put forward by the critics in this connection do not necessarily prove that Kālidāsa lived in the Gupta period. There is nothing strange in the titles *Kumārasambhava* and *Vikramorvaśīya* to suggest their connection with the kings of the Gupta period. The word '*Kumāra*' is too familiar a word which requires no explanation. The word also means Subrahmanya, the son of Śiva the word '*Vikrama*' means valour and the title *Vikramorvaśīya* means the play about Urvāśī who was won by King Purūravas with his valour. Samudra-

1. Kālidāsa : *Kumārasambhava* Canto VII. 1.

gupta's march of conquest, which was repelled by the Pandya king on the bank of the R. Kāverī, could not have served as the model for the description of Raghu's march of conquest which the poet describes as extending beyond the banks of the R. Kaveri and covering the southernmost region of the peninsula. The use of the word Huns cannot also support the view of the Western critics, for the Huns were occupying the Western part of India from the 2nd century B. C. Thus these do not prove Kālidāsa's connection with the Gupta period.

One another evidence is brought forward to prove that Kālidāsa did not live in the 1st century B. C. but long after the 1st century A. D. Aśvaghōṣa, the Buddhist philosopher and poet, lived in the 1st century A. D. His poems the *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* resemble the poems of Kālidāsa in certain descriptions and some expressions. Buddha's passing through the streets is described by Aśvaghōṣa in a manner similar to that of Śiva in the *Kumārasambhava* and of Aja in the *Raghuramśa*. These show that Kālidāsa had copied from Aśvaghōṣa these descriptions.

This view too is quite unconvincing. There are of course similar features in the works of the two writers. They do not however prove that Kālidāsa was the borrower. Gautama is passing through the street not in a procession and certainly not during the night; yet, the women are said to have woke up from their sleep, and not completely attending to their toilet rushed to the windows to have a look at Gautama. The reference to their sleep, toilet and their eagerness to witness the prince show that the description is out of place and that it must have been borrowed from some other work. In Kālidāsa's works the descriptions are repeated in the same stanzas which shows that Kālidāsa, had he been the borrower, would not have included in his two different poems what he borrowed. 'The thief does not make a display of the stolen goods.' Besides, certain grammatical expressions, which are rare in their occurrence in Kālidāsa's works, are found repeated in Aśvaghōṣa's works. Therefore, Aśvaghōṣa must have borrowed from Kālidāsa.

Moreover, Aśvaghōṣa, who is said to be the reputed predecessor of Kālidāsa, is not mentioned by other writers who came after him nor did any one care to imitate him. It cannot be maintained that Kālidāsa imitated Aśvaghōṣa and excelled him, for then Vatsabhaṭṭi's inscription could have served as a model for Kālidāsa. The fact is that Aśvaghōṣa was first a philosopher and then a poet. He must have had for his model a poem of a reputed writer. The features exhibited by his works show that Kālidāsa must have been this poet of repute. Kālidāsa's date must therefore be fixed in the 1st century B. C., the date of Aśvaghōṣa being in the 1st century A. D.

To support this date of the poet, evidences are found in his works. He uses certain expressions like *dāśvān*, *viśrāmahctoḥ*, *pelava*, *trymbaka*, *triyambaka*, *āsa* and others. The periphrastic perfect is split up e.g., तं पातयात् प्रयत्नमात् पपात पद्मात्। These are not correct in the light of the rules of Pāṇini. He must have been living at a time when the rules of Pāṇini and the rules of Patañjali did not become binding on the poets. The first century prior to the birth of Christ appears to be this time.

The severe punishment given to the fisherman for theft and the law of inheritance as they are found recorded in the *Śākuntala* point to a period in the pre-Christian era when Manu, Vasiṣṭha and Āpastamba who uphold these views were held as the authorities on law and when Bṛhaspati, Yājñavalkya and others, who held a milder view, had not become authorities.

Lastly, the inclusion of the word Agnimitra in the *Bharatavākya* of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* suggests the poets' connection with Agnimitra since it represents a departure in the poets' practice of wishing for general prosperity in the *Bharatavākya* as in the two other dramas. The events of political interest given in this play suggest that the poet was aware of those occurrences which took place during the lifetime of Agnimitra. These events are not found recorded anywhere except in this drama of the poet. He was perhaps a contemporary of Agnimitra or lived in the 1st century B. C. when the minds of the people were still fresh with the memories of those events. The mention of Vidiśā in the *Meghasandesa* as a prosperous country lends support to his connection with Agnimitra who was the king of Vidiśā. On these evidences, it is better to hold that Kālidāsa lived in the 1st century B. C. probably connected with King Vikramāditya who founded an era in 56 B. C.

Kālidāsa is the author of two poems *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava*, a lyric *Meghasandesa* and three plays *Mālavikāgnimitra*, *Vikramorvaśīya* and *Śākuntala*.

The poems of Kālidāsa :—

The *Kumārasambhava* is a *Mahākāvya* in eight cantos describing the circumstances that led to the birth of Subrahmanya. The gods oppressed by the demon Tāraka seek the aid of the creator who directs them to bring about the marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī which would result in the birth of a son who would kill the demon. Cupid is deputed to create love for Pārvatī in the mind of Śiva who was then in meditation. Cupid's attempt results in his being reduced to ashes by Śiva who gets angry at the disturbance caused to his meditation. Śiva then disappears. Pārvatī performs penance to win Śiva. Śiva appears in disguise, tests her devotion and makes a promise to marry her. The seven sages settle the marriage between

Śiva and Pārvatī. After the marriage is celebrated, the poet describes in the last canto the pleasures enjoyed by the wedded pair. The poem ends with this canto. It is held that owing to the criticism levelled against him for having described the pleasures of the divine pair, Kālidāsa did not write beyond the eighth canto. The title is justified as applied to the contents of these cantos, because the circumstances which led to the birth of the son, namely the marriage between Śiva and Pārvatī, are described here. An attempt was made by a later writer who found the title inadequate as applied to the eight cantos, and composed nine more cantos in continuation of the eight cantos. The birth of Subrahmaṇya and his victory over the demon Tāraka are described in these cantos. The expressions which Kālidāsa would have avoided, occur in these cantos. The rhetoricians have not cited even a line from this portion. No writer of repute commented on it. These show that this portion was not from the pen of Kālidāsa.

The *Raghuvamśa* is a *Mahākāvya* in 19 cantos describing the lives of the kings of the race of Raghu. The lives of Dilīpa, Raghu, Aja, Daśaratha, Rāma, Kuśa, Lava and their successors are dealt with in the poem. The poem ends with the death of Agnivarṇa.

The choice of the theme for his *Kumārasambhava* made the poet give realistic and vivid pictures of the Himalayas and the advent of the spring. The description of the marriage of Pārvatī and Śiva shows how Kālidāsa was a close observer of the traditions practised in the land. The conversation between Pārvatī and Śiva in disguise is singular its kind.

The lack of a single theme for his *Raghuvamśa* is amply compensated by the narrative accounts which the poet gives in this poem. The vivid scenes are the conversation between Dilīpa and the phantom of the lion, that between Raghu and Indra, the description of Indumati's *svayamvara*, Aja's lament at the death of Indumati, the effective summary of the story of the Ayodhyā and the following four *kāṇḍas* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the description of Raghu's march of victory. The 13th canto is superb in its description on which Kālidāsa has lavished all his poetic talents. The 14th canto is the best revealing the poets' powers to suggest the feelings. Some of the cantos *e.g.*, 9th, 15, 17th and others do not rise to any high level. The 9th contains a display of the poets' skill at alliteration. On these grounds, it is contended that Kālidāsa could have written up to the end of the 8th canto. The choice of the theme must have been responsible for this uneven nature of the poem. If the poet is denied the authorship for this remaining portion of the poem, then the cantos 10, 13 and 14 and also 16, which could be considered as the best portions of the poem, would make the poet's reputation suffer badly.

It is not easy to decide which poem was composed earlier. From the points of style and diction, the line of distinction can hardly been drawn between the two poems although the *Raghuvamśa* has better claims of having been a later production. However, the opening lines in the *Raghuvamśa* show that Kālidāsa was only a novice in the field of poetry. This may show the poem as an earlier production. The abrupt end of the poem in the 19th canto is sought to be accounted for as due to the poets' death. Probably the poet did not continue to write because of the vaning glory of the line of princes whom he chose to treat in the poem. This cannot therefore prove its production later. The treatment of love in the *Kumārasambhava* is better and shows a developed form, though the *Raghuvamśa* is not utterly devoid of references to it. It is, therefore, possible to hold that the poet wrote the *Kumārasambhava* later.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE KĀVYA LITERATURE—POST-KALIDĀSA PERIOD

The writer about whom there is reliable evidence and who came after Kālidāsa is Aśvaghoṣa. He is the author of the two *Mahākāvyas* *Saundarananda* and *Buddhacarita*. From the colophon of the *Saundarananda*, it is learnt that he was the son of Suvarṇākṣī and a resident of Sāketa. He had the titles Bhikṣu, Ācārya Bhadanta, Mahākavi and Mahāvādin. He proved his worth by making the horses listen to his lectures leaving aside the fodder. Hence he came to be called Aśvaghoṣa. He was born a brahmin and became converted into Buddhism. The Chinese tradition makes him a contemporary or preceptor of Kanīṣka who ruled India in the 1st Century A. D. Aśvaghoṣa was one of the founders of the *Mahāyāna* sect of Buddhism. His date is in the 1st century A. D.

The *Saundarananda* in 18 cantos describes how Gautama Buddha converted into a Buddhist monk his half-brother Nanda. Nanda was reluctant to come away from his wife Sundarī. Ānanda, one of the pupils of Buddha, persuaded by his preachings Nanda to become a recluse and work under Buddha. The *Buddhacarita* describes the life of Buddha which is too well-known and therefore needs no recounting here. According to the Chinese and Tibetan translations of this poem, it was written in 28 cantos. The first 13 cantos were reconstructed into *Saṃskṛta* with a supplement by one Amṛtānanda of the 19th century A. D. The text of the poem was translated into Chinese between 414 and 421 A. D. and into Tibetan in the 7th century A. D.

Aśvaghoṣa's style is rough. The poems are bound in alliteration. He displays his skill in using rare grammatical forms some among them being foreign to *Saṃskṛta*. For example, he uses *kim bata* in the place of *kim uta*, *saced* in the place of *ced* and so on. He is the earliest Buddhist poet and philosopher to use *Saṃskṛta* discarding *Prākṛta*.

After Aśvaghoṣa, for nearly three centuries, no poet of repute is known to have flourished. It appears as though literary practice was entirely given up during this period. Prof. Max Müller propounded his Renaissance theory in which he tried to account for the absence of poetry writing during this period. This theory tells that the foreigners who invaded India after the 1st century A. D. suppressed the literary activity of the Indians and they held sway over India till 544 A. D. when king Vikramāditya of Ujjain defeated and expelled them. This king revived *Saṃskṛta* learning and under his patronage, eminent poets flourished. This theory was not

questioned by certain scholars who, believing in the statement of the professor, made certain statements about the condition of Indian literature during this period. One scholar said. 'The real history of the *Kāvya* or artificial epic poetry of India, does not begin till the first half of the seventh century A. D.' 'The date of no *Kāvya* before this landmark has as yet been fixed with certainty.'¹

This Renaissance theory was exploded by the researches conducted by Bühler and Fleet. They have proved that the Śākas and other foreigners became Indians, patronised learning and architecture and sculpture. Rṣabhadatta, Kanīṣka, Rudradāman and others became patrons of *Saṃskṛta* learning. Moreover, these invaders occupied only a portion of India. They could not have caused the decline of *Saṃskṛta* learning in the remaining parts of India. It must be remembered that the foreigners were overthrown not by Vikramāditya in 544 A. D. but by Yaśovarman Viṣṇuvardhana. A beginning was made about 400 A. D. or even earlier by the Gupta emperors to clear the foreign tribes out of India.

There are evidences to show that the literary activity of the people was not entirely given up during this period. An inscription of Rudradāman was written about 150—2 A. D. at Girnar in the Junagad State. The purpose of it was to commemorate the restoration of the lake Sudarśana. From the inscription, it is clear that Rudradāman, who wrote the inscription, was a king of the Śākas. He was quite familiar with the rules of rhetorics. The ornate prose style of Bāṇa who lived in the first half of the 7th century A. D. has traces of its beginning in the style of this inscription.

The inscription at Nasik was written in *Prākṛta* in the 19th year of Siri Pulumāyi of Pratiṣṭhāna. The date of the inscription comes to 149 A. D. The inscription appears to have been rendered into *Prākṛta* from an original in *Saṃskṛta*. It contains long compounds. Alliteration and the stock-comparisons of the classical literature fill it.

The Gupta period has two prominent inscriptions. The first is by Harīṣeṇa who wrote a panegyric of Samudragupta his patron. It is recorded in a pillar at Allahabad and is dated 345 A. D. Written in the *Vaidarbhī* style,¹ it begins with eight stanzas which are followed by a long prose and ends with a stanza. Puns and metaphors occur frequently in it. The other is by Vīrasena, the minister of Candragupta II in whose praise it was composed. The poet and his patron are spoken as men of learning.

1. A. A. Macdonell : History of Sanskrit Literature P. 318.

2. *Vaidarbhī* and *Gauḍī* are the two prominent styles. An account of these is given in chapter 25 of this book.

Apart from these, there were written in this period a number of inscriptions some in *Prākṛta* and others in *Sam̐skṛta*. These prove that literary pursuits were not given up during this period. The popularity of *Sam̐skṛta* as a literary language is shown here. The figures of speech and sound, which characterise the works written in the later years, are found prominently used in these inscriptions. All these prove that the literary practise was continued in this period. There must have lived poets of eminence whose works have been lost. Or, owing to repeated political invasions, it might not have been possible for certain princes, who were patrons of learning, to extend their patronage to the poets. In the absence of royal patronage which gave an impetus to literary pursuits, the men of letters could not produce any work of standing merit. The real condition of this period cannot be ascertained until the political history of India is rewritten.

To this period belongs the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana. This work gives a picture of the man of fashion. Directions are given as to how he should behave, spend the time, and have a good company. The detailed account of the mode of life, which he is to pursue, is given in this work and it has left a lasting influence on the writers who came later. Incidents and descriptions in the works of these writers are introduced in them more as a result of the desire of their authors to conform to the details given in the *Kāmasūtra* than due to their inclusion in the context out of necessity. The *Kāmasūtra* refers to a king of the Sātavāhana or Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty. This king must have lived about the beginning of the Christian era. The Āndhra dynasty came to an end about 218 A. D. Vātsyāyana's date may be fixed about this period. Thus it is seen that this period of literature was not really dark. The Gupta emperors are said to have revived *Sam̐skṛta* learning, but it is not clear why the names of the poets who were patronised by the Guptas have not come down.

The first writer after the expiry of this dark period is Menṭha or Bhartṛmenṭha. He was also called Hastipaka. He was a poet under Mātṛgupta of Kashmir who ruled about 430 A. D. His poem *Hayagrīvavadha* is now lost and is remembered only in citations from it in the works on rhetorics.

Vatsabhaṭṭi wrote a panegyric in 472 A. D. It is inscribed in a pillar near Mandasor. The author wrote the work for the silk-weavers of the locality. It is written in the *Gauḍī* style and shows traces of having been influenced by the *Meghasam̐deśa* and the *Rtusam̐hāra*. The spring and the rainy seasons are described in detail.

Pravarasena is known as the author of a poem *Setubandha* in *Prākṛta*. It is also called *Rāvaṇavadha* and *Daśamukharadha*. In fifteen chapters called *āśvāsas*, the author describes the story of the

Rāmāyaṇa. Some critics hold that the work was written to commemorate the construction of a bridge of boats across the R. Jhelum. Some others hold that Pravarasena was the king of Kashmir and Kālidāsa, who was in his court, wrote this poem. This cannot be conceded, for Bāṇa, who knows both Pravarasena and Kālidāsa, does not suggest for Kālidāsa the authorship of the *Setubandha*. The work has won the appreciation of Bāṇa¹ and Daṇḍin². The date of the author is to be placed in the 4th century A. D.

Buddhaghosa, who was originally a brahmin and later a Buddhist, wrote a poem *Pādyacudāmaṇi* in ten cantos describing the life of Gautama Buddha. His account of certain events differs from that of Aśvaghoṣa. He was greatly influenced by Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa. The style of the poem is simple and elegant. According to the Buddhist sources, he was sent in 387 A. D. to bring from Ceylon a *Pāli* version of the commentaries on the three *Piṭakas* of Buddha. He copied a number of works, translated and commented on a number of them. One of his works was translated into Chinese in 488 A. D. He may therefore be placed about 400 A. D.

Bhīma also called as Bhaumaka wrote *Rāvanārjunīya* or *Arjunarāvanīya* a poem in 27 cantos describing the battle between Rāvaṇa and Kārtavīryārjuna. At the same time the work serves as an illustration to the rules of grammar. Bhīma is cited in the grammatical work *Kāśikāvṛtti* written about 600 A. D. The date of this work must therefore be about 500 A. D. Bhaṭṭi's *Rāvaṇavadha* and Hālāyudha's *Kavirahasya* are similar to this work in treatment.

Kumārādāsa is the author of a poem *Jānakīharṇa* which describes the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The author is identified with King Kumārdāsa of Ceylon (517-26 A. D.). The original of the work is lost and is available in a *Sinhalese* word-for-word translation. It is said to contain 25 cantos. The first fourteen cantos and a part of the fifteenth have been restored into *Saṃskṛta*. The fact, however, of the original size of the work, is different. There is a manuscript of the poem³ in 20 cantos. It is complete and agrees with the portion of the poem which is now available in print except for some slight differences in the readings. From this manuscript of the poem, it is learnt that the author Kumārādāsa wrote the poem with the help of his two maternal uncles. The 17th canto abounds in alliteration of the *yamaka* type. The author displays his skill in the use of the *Sabdālaṅkāras* in the 18th canto. Rama's return to the capital in the aerial car is described in the 20th canto.

1. Bāṇa : *Harṣacharita* Introductory verse 14.

2. Daṇḍin : *Avantisundarīkathā* Introductory verse 13.

3. The manuscript is available in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library. Catalogue No. of the Ms. R. 2935.

The identity of the author is hard to be ascertained. If he were identical with Kumāradāsa king of Ceylon then the date of the poem is to be fixed in C 520. A. D. The author appears to have been a great admirer of Kālidāsa whom he imitated with success. This evoked the admiration of the rhetorician Rājasekhara (C. 900 A. D.) who wrote on the poet the following verse :—

जानकीहृगं कर्तुं रघुवंजे स्थिते सति ।

कविः कुमारदासश्च गंधर्वाश्च यदि क्षमः ॥

Bhāravi is the author of a *Mahākāvya* called *Kirātārjunīya* in 18 cantos. It is based on the story of the *Mahābhārata*. During the period of exile, Arjuna took the advice of Vyāsa, went to the Himālayas and performed penance to get a miraculous weapon from Siva. In order to test his devotion, Siva appeared in the guise of a hunter chasing a boar. Both Siva and Arjuna aimed an arrow each at the boar. The animal was killed and Arjuna asserted his claim for the prey. Thereupon a quarrel ensued between Siva and Arjuna which turned out to become an attack on each other with weapons. Finally Siva, who became the victor, blessed Arjuna and granted him a weapon which was presided over by him (*pāśupatāstra*). Arjuna then returned to meet his brothers. This theme is taken from the *Mahābhārata*. Certain changes also have been introduced. In the beginning of the poem, a spy who was sent to get information about Duryodhana's rule, returned to tell the Pāṇdavas of the wise and just rule of Duryodhana and thus induced Arjuna to get miraculous powers. At the end of the poem, both Siva and Subrahmanya are shown as attacking Arjuna.

Bhāravi's work is full of spirit and vigour. His descriptions are vivid. His style is forcible and pregnant with sense but rough.¹ He exhibits his skill in the careful use of the rules of grammar. In the 15th canto, he displays his skill in playing with words. Some stanzas remain the same yielding the same sense when read in the ordinary way and in the reverse way. Some stanzas have only two consonants. One stanza has only one consonant. It is said that 'he is in many ways the beginner of mannerisms in the later poets'. This may be true to some extent only if Bhāravi's priority to Kumāradāsa is to be established. Bhāravi follows the school of *Mānava* while discussing the questions of politics. The last stanza in each canto has a mark by the use of the word '*lakṣmī*'. Bhāravi is mentioned in the Aihole inscription dated 634 A. D. He may be placed therefore before 600 A. D.²

1. भारवेर्यगौरवम्

नारिकेलफलसम्मितं वचो भारवेः । Mallinātha

2. See Chapter 17 under Daṇḍin.

Bhaṭṭi wrote a poem *Rāvaṇavadha* in twenty-two cantos describing the story of Rāma. He tells that he wrote the work at Valabhī which was ruled by Śrīdharasena¹. There were four kings with this name who ruled at Valabhī and the last king with this name ruled about 644 A. D. The last king was a patron of letters. It is probable that the poet Bhaṭṭi wrote his poem about 644 A. D. It may be remarked in this connection that an inscription of Dharasena of IV of the Valabhī dynasty is dated *Samvat* 326². This date may refer to the Valabhī era which was begun in 318 A. D. The name Bhaṭṭi, which is a *Prākṛta* form of the *Saṃskṛta* word *Bhartr*, has given room for the suggestion to rise identifying Bhaṭṭi and Bhartrhari the grammarian. This identification, which is approved by the Indian commentators, is based on the fact that both were well-versed in grammar. While Bhartrhari wrote a treatise on the philosophical aspect of grammar, the other wrote the poem *Rāvaṇavadha* to illustrate the rules of grammar. The dates of the two writers differ and hence this identification cannot be supported.

The poem *Rāvaṇavadha*, besides being a poem, serves as an illustration to the rules of grammar and figures of speech. The thirteenth canto is written in a manner allowing the stanzas to be read both as *Saṃskṛta* and *Prākṛta*. Bhaṭṭi's style is simple and free from long compounds. It belongs to the *Vaidarbhī* type. The popularity of the work is made known by its another name *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya* after the name of the author.

Māgha was the son of Dattaka and grandson of Suprabhaddeva who superintended the affairs of King Śrīvarmala. There is an inscription dated 625 A. D. about a king Varmalāta who might have been identical with Śrīvarmala. Māgha is mentioned by Ānandavardhana (850 A. D.) Nṛpatuṅga (850 A. D.) and Rājasekhara (900 A. D.). A reference, in his poem *Śiśupālavadha*³, is found to the Nyāsa a commentary on the *Kāśikāvartti* by Jinendrabuddhi (circa 700 A. D.). Mallinātha the commentator supports this interpretation. From these evidences, his date may be fixed about 700 A. D.

Māgha wrote a poem *Śiśupālavadha* in twenty cantos describing the sacrifice *Rājasūya* performed by Yudhiṣṭhira and the death of Śiśupāla at the hands of Kṛṣṇa whom the former insulted. It is closely modelled on Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*. Both begin with the word *Śriyaḥ* and have no benediction. Political discussions, marching of a party, description of the mountain scenery, drinking parties and finally a battle scene are successively described in both. Like Bhāravi, Māgha describes the battle by the display of his powers in *Śabdālaṅkāra*. It may be said that in the nineteenth canto which exhibits

1. Bhaṭṭi's *Rāvaṇavadha* XXII—35.

2. The Collected Works of Bhandarkar Vol. III P. 228.

3. *Śiśupālavadha* II—112.

these features, Māgha has excelled Bhāravi¹. There is a stanza with a single consonant. He has profound command over the rules of grammar and figures of speech. His vocabulary is very rich and it is said that no new word could be met with if the first nine cantos are studied². The last stanza in each canto has the word 'śrī' as its peculiar mark. An oft-quoted stanza ascribes to Māgha, skill in the use of similes, depth of expression and elegant use of words⁴.

Vākapati wrote a *Prākṛta* poem *Gauḍavaho* describing the death of a Gauḍa prince at the hands of the poet's patron Yaśovarman of Kanauj. The work is incomplete, and stops with the defeat of Yaśovarman about 733 A. D. at the hands of Lalitāditya of Kashmir. The poet wrote his work probably after this date. The date of the poem can therefore be about 740 A. D. The author admits his indebtedness to Bhavabhūti the famous dramatist whom the author makes a poet in the court of his patron. The work is full of long compounds. It shows the place occupied by the *Prākṛta* language during the classical *Sanskṛta* period. The author makes a reference, in this poem, to his earlier poem *Madhumathanavijaya* which is now lost.

Haricandra, a Jain, is the author of a poem *Dharmaśarmābhyudaya* in 21 cantos describing the life of Dharmanatha a Jain saint. He was influenced by Māgha and Vākpati. His date must therefore be after 800 A. D. His identity is not known.

Nītivarman is the author of a poem *Kīcakavadha* in five cantos describing the death of Kīcaka at the hands of Bhīmasena. Alliteration and pun are used profusely in the poem. Nothing definite is known about the date and identity of the author. The critics place him in the 9th century A. D. on the strength of a reference to his work by Bhoja (1005-1054 A. D.).

The *Haravijaya* a poem in 50 cantos was written by Ratnākara, who was in the courts of Jayāditya and Avantivarman of Kashmir. He had the titles Rājānaka, Vagīśvara and Vidyādhipati. His date is therefore C. 850 A. D. His poem, which consists of 4000 stanzas describes the death of a demon Andhaka at the hands of Śiva. A demon who was born blind of Śiva practised austerities and became the lord of the worlds by his supreme power. Alarmed at this, the gods sought the help of Śiva who marched against the demon and killed him. The work appears to have been composed with the sole

1. तावद्भा भारवे भर्ति यावन्नाघस्य नोदयः ।
उदिते तु पुनर्भा भारवे भर्ति रवेरिब ॥
2. Magha's *Śisupalavadha* XIX—114.
3. नवसर्गगते माघे नवशब्दो न विद्यते ।
4. उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेर्यगौरवम् ।
दण्डिनः पदलालित्यं माघे सन्ति त्रयो गुणाः ॥

intention of obeying the rules laid down by the rhetoricians for a *Mahākāvya*. It is disproportionately long. The author admits that he was attempting to imitate the prose writer Bāṇa. As a poem, this work does not rise to a high level but its value is high for the information it contains on the principles of dancing.

Sivasvāmin or better known as Bhaṭṭa Śivasvāmin wrote under Avantivarman of Kashmir (850 A. D.) a poem *Kappanābhyudaya* in twenty cantos describing how a king of the South Kappana by name made attempts to attack Prasenajit of Śrāvastī and how in the end his attack resulted in his own conversion into Buddhism without any battle being waged with Prasenajit. The march of the army of Kappana to the north provides the poet with an occasion to describe the rise and setting of the sun and moon and the drinking parties held by the soldiers. The theme is taken from the *Avadānaśatakas* of the Buddhists. The poem shows the influence of Māgha and Bhāravi.

Abhinanda, son of Śatānanda of Kashmir wrote a poem *Rāmacarita* about the story of Rāma. He is quoted by Bhoja (1000 A. D.) and Mahimabhaṭṭa (1025 A. D.). He is placed in the first half of the 9th century A. D. The poem, which is written in a simple and elegant style, was left incomplete by the author who wrote thirty-six cantos. Two versions of four more cantos which complete the story are available by two different writers.

Dhanañjaya a Jain wrote a poem *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* in which he described the story of Rāma and Pāṇḍavas simultaneously by taking recourse to pun. *Dvisandhāna*, the type of composition to which it belongs, became popular in course of time. Compositions of this type were written by Kavirāja (1200 A. D.), Rāmacandra (1542 A. D.), Cidambara (1600 A. D.), Veṅkaṭādhvarin (1650 A. D.), Meghavijayagaṇi (1670 A. D.), Haradattasūri (before 1700 A. D.) and others. Dhanañjaya lived in the first half of the 10th century A. D.

Kanakasenavādirāja, (C. 950 A. D.), a Jain ascetic, wrote a poem *Yaśodharacarita* in four cantos describing the life of Yaśodhara, a king of the Jain faith.

Halāyudha is the author of a poem *Kavirahasya* which gives illustrations for the rules of grammar pertaining to the verbs. The forms of the verbs in the present tense are given. The author praises through these verbal forms his patron Kṛṣṇa who is identified with the Raṣṭrakūṭa King III (940-56). The author may therefore be placed in the latter half of the 10th century A. D.

Abhinanda, also called Gauḍābhinanda, was the son of the logician Jayanta (circa 900 A. D.). He must be taken to have lived about 950 A. D. He wrote in eight cantos a poem *Kadambarīkathāśāra* summarising Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.

Padmagupta also called Parimala is the author of a poem *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* in eighteen cantos. He wrote this in 1005 A. D. He was a poet under King Muṇja (970 A. D.) and Bhoja (1005-10054 A. D.). His admiration for Kālidāsa was great and whatever poetic piece he composed it resembled that of *Kālidāsa*. Probably on account of this he was named Parimalakālidāsa. In this poem, he describes the life of his patron whose title was Navasāhasāṅka. He describes the hunting excursions of his patron whose marriage with Śaṣiprabhā a Nāga princess is also described.

Kṣemendra of Kashmir, who was also called Vyāsadāsa, was the pupil of Abhinavagupta (1000 A. D.). His literary activities are to be fixed roughly in the middle of the 11th century A. D. He is the author of many works in the various branches of study. He abridged the *Mahābhārata* in the *Bhāratamañjarī*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* in the *Rāmāyaṇamañjarī*, and the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*. These three are metrical. His *Daśāvatāracarita* is a poem on the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. His *Padyakādambarī* is a versified rendering of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*. Most of his other works are lost. From his own citations in his *Aucityavicāracarcā* and other works, it is known that *Śaṣivṣaṁśamahākāvya* and *Amṛtatarāṅga-kāvya* were some of his poems which are now lost. His abridgements of the epics and other works do not reveal his poetic ability. These are written in an easy-flowing style resembling that of the *Purāṇas* and the epics.

Bilhaṇa- was born in Kashmir as the son of Jyeṣṭhakalaśa. After his study there, he left Kashmir about 1050 A. D. After considerable wandering, he settled about the year 1070 A. D. in the court of Trailokyamalla, the Calūkyā king who was ruling at Anhilvad. After a few years, he left that court and became the poet under Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāṇa. He wrote about 1085 A. D. a poem *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* in eighteen cantos describing the ancestry and life of his patron. The hunting expedition of his patron and the latter's marriage with Candralekhā, the daughter of a Śīlahara princess are also described in the poem. In the last canto, he gives an account of his wanderings. Bilhaṇa is a master of vivid description. His style is elegant and is a good specimen of the *Vaidarbhī* type. In this poem he refers to another work of his on Rāma which is now lost.

Kṛṣṇalīlāsuka also called Bilvamaṅgala was born in Malabar in the 12th century A. D. He wrote a number of works which are brought under different heads like lyrics, philosophy, grammar, poetry and others. His *Govindābhiṣeka* is a poem in twelve cantos illustrating the rules of the *Prākṛta* grammar. This work is also called *Śricihnakāvya* and is the best known among his poems. Incidentally it describes the glory of his favourite deity Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Mañkha is the author of the *Śrīkañṭhacaṭita* a poem in twenty-five cantos describing the destruction of the three cities by Śiva. It contains many of the features of a *Mahākāvya*. In the last canto, he gives an account of the life in the court of his brother Lañka also called Alaṅkāra who was the minister of King Jayasimha of Kashmir (1129-50 A. D.). Rājasekhara, Murāri and others are mentioned by him as the poets who preceded him. Kalhaṇa, Bilhaṇa and Jalhaṇa were his contemporaries. No information is available about others whom he says his brother Alaṅkāra patronised. Mañkha was one of the four brothers all of whom were men of letters and were occupying high positions in the state. Kalhaṇa refers to him as a minister in the state. He was a pupil of Ruyyaka, the rhetorician. His date may be fixed about 1150 A. D.

Kalhaṇa is the author of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* a work on the history of Kashmir written in the form of a poem. It contains eight chapters. He began to write the work in 1149 A. D. His date therefore is to be fixed about 1150 A. D. His work stops with the reign of Jayasimha. It is a fine piece of literary composition embellished by figures of speech.

Jalhaṇa is the author of a poem *Somapālavilāsa* being a history of King Somapāla. He was patronised by this king who ruled at Rājapuri. His name is mentioned by Mañkha. His date must therefore be about 1150 A. D.

Vāgbhaṭa is the author of the *Neminirvāṇa* a poem in praise of Neminātha a Jain saint. The author lived about 1150 A. D. At about the same period Sandhyākaranandin wrote the *Rāmapālacarita* a poem in praise of his patron King Rāmapāla of Bengal (1104—1130 A. D.). It gives a history of this king and at the same time gives the story of Rāma. In this respect, it is a *dvisandhānakāvya*.

Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.) was a writer in many branches of study. He was a Jain and he was patronised by King Jayasimha and his successor Kumārapāla both of whom ruled at Anhilvad in Gujarat in the 12th century. It was through his efforts that King Kumārapāla became a Jain and Jainism became the state religion. Hemacandra is the author of the two poems *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* and *Dvyāśrayakāvya*. The former is in ten *parvans* and describes the life of sixty-three men of the Jain faith. The latter gives a history of Kumārapāla, the poet's patron. Hence it is also called *Kumārapālacarita*. It has twenty cantos written in *Saṁskṛta* and eight cantos in *Prākṛta*. Hence it is called *Dvyāśrayakāvya*. The work illustrates the rules of grammar framed by the author himself for the *Prākṛta* language. These *Saṁskṛta* and two poems reveal the author's ambition to make Jainism popular through poetry.

Kavirāja was patronised by King Kāmadeva (1182-97 A. D.) of the Kādamba dynasty. He is to be placed therefore about 1190 A.D. He calls himself as the master of figurative expression (*rakrokti*) and seeks for himself a place by the side of Bāṇa and Subandhu. He is the author of the two poems *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* and *Pārijātaḥaraṇa*. The former belongs to the *dvīsandhāna* type of poems describing the story of Rāma and of the Pāṇḍavas in thirteen cantos. The latter is in ten cantos describing the bringing of the heavenly tree Pārijāta from heaven by Kṛṣṇa.

Śrīharṣa was the son of Hīra and Māmalladevī. He was patronised by Kings Vijayacandra and Jayacandra of Kanauj in the latter half of the 12th century A. D. He practised the *Cintāmaṇi-mantra*¹ and attained proficiency in the various arts. He is the author of a number of works. Among his poems, the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* is alone available. It is believed that he wrote this poem in sixty cantos of which only twenty-two are now available. The story of Nala and Damayantī which is dealt with in this poem is left incomplete in the last canto now available. This poem, which comes under the *Mahākāvya* type of poems, reveals the author's originality in the treatment of the sentiment, figures of speech and other aspects of a poem. He does not pay heed to the rules of the rhetoricians. In fancy and imagination, he observes no limit. He displays his erudition by drawing instances for his figures of speech from the branches of philosophy and grammar. His work can be called a *Śāstrakāvya*. His style is very terse and could not be followed except with the aid of a lexicon. Hence arose the saying नैषधं विद्वदोपयत् । At the end of some of the cantos in this work, he mentions the other works composed by him. The *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍakhāḍya*, *Gauḍorvīśakulaprasasti*, *Arṇavavarṇana*, and *Sāhasāṅkacarita*, are some among these works. Except the first mentioned work, the others are not available.

Caṇḍakavi wrote a poem *Prthvīrājaviṇaya* celebrating the victory of Prthvīrāja king of Ajmir and Delhi over Sultan Shahbuddin Ghori in 1191 A. D. The work which has been printed has eight cantos and has lacunæ and is not complete. The author's date may therefore be fixed in 1200 A. D. Caṇḍakavi's authorship of this work lacks confirmation.

Kṛṣṇānanda of Pūri is the author of a poem *Sahṛdayānanda* in fifteen cantos describing the life of Nala. It has the elegance and simplicity of the *Vaidarbhī* style of which the author is a master. It is one of the few *Saṃskṛta* poems which command a good and interesting reading. The author lived about the beginning of the 13th century A. D. At almost the same time, Jayaratha of Kashmir wrote his *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* in thirty-two sections called *prakāśas*

1. Śrīharṣa : *Naiṣadhīyacarita* Canto I. 145.

written in verse-form about the exploits of Śiva and the practices of the Kashmirian Śaivites. To the same period belongs Abhayadeva a Jain, who wrote in 1221 A. D., a poem *Jayantavijaya* in nineteen cantos about the life of Jayanta a king in the family of Vikramasimha.

Arisimha, who was patronised by Vastupāla, minister of King Vīradhavalā (c. 1220), wrote in 1222 A. D., a poem *Sukṛtasa-n-kīrtana* in eleven cantos on the genealogy of Vīradhavalā and the charitable deeds of Vastupāla. Bālacandrasūri, an admirer of Vastupāla, wrote in 1240 A. D., a poem *Vasantavilāsa* in fourteen cantos describing the work of Vastupāla. Someśvaradeva, a friend of Vastupāla, was patronised by Vīradhavalā. He lived in the first half of the 13th century A. D. He wrote a poem *Surathotsava* in fifteen cantos describing the glory of King Suratha of the Caitra race. Connected with these poets, who were patronised by Vastupāla, was Amaracandra (1250 A. D.) the author of a poem *Bālabhārata* in forty-four cantos. It describes the story of the Mahābhārata. In its elegance of style, it approaches the Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa.

Devaprabhasūri, who lived about 1250 A. D. wrote a poem *Pāṇḍavacarita* in eighteen cantos describing the life of the Pāṇḍavas laying stress on the practice of virtue. About the Jain saint Prabhāvaka, Candraprabhasūri wrote in 1278 A. D. a poem *Prabhāvakacarita*. Vīranandin wrote in the 13th century A. D. a poem *Candraprabhacarita* in eighteen cantos describing the life of King Kanakaprabha and Candraprabha a Jain saint. Sarvānanda wrote about 1300 A. D. a poem *Jagadūcarita* in seven cantos in praise of the help rendered by a pious Jain to the people in Gujarat during a famine which overtook them in 1256 A. D. Nayacandra wrote about 1310 a poem *Ham-mīramahākāvya* in 14 cantos. It describes how Hammīra a king of the Chohan race gave protection to a Moghul nobleman from Allaudin for which act his capital was besieged by Allaudin and he was killed.

Vāsudeva was the son of one Maharṣi and Gopālikā who were the inhabitants of a sacred place Vedāranya in Malabar. He wrote twenty-one works among which some were poems full of *yamaka*. The *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya* and *Nalodaya* are the two widely known poems among these. The former describes the success achieved by Yudhiṣṭhira in eight *āśvāsas* and the latter has four *āśvāsas* describing the life of Nala after he got back the kingdom. The former work refers to one Kulāśekhara as the king during the time of whose rule the work was composed. The latter mentions Rāma as the king. These two references are not helpful in fixing the date of the author. There were a number of kings in Malabar who had the title Kulāśekhara. The scholarly world is not yet decided in expressing its view on the identity of this author and his date. There were a number of poets in Malabar with the name Vāsudeva. Some critics hold that

Vāsudeva, the author of the *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya*, was different from Vāsudeva who wrote the *Nalodaya*. The reference to Kuḷaśekhara in the *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya* has made some scholars fix Vāsudeva its author about 800 A. D. when, it is believed, a king Kuḷaśekhara by name ruled the Kerala land. Some others bring the author to the 16th century identifying him with Vāsudeva the son of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, the author of the *Nārāyaṇīya*. The date of *Nalodaya* must be prior to 1599 which is the date of its earliest manuscript. Uddaṇḍakavi (c. 1400 A. D.) refers to Maḥarṣi, the father of Vāsudeva¹. Vācaspatimiśra's (c. 850 A. D.) *Nyāyakanikā* was commented by Para-meśvara, nephew of Vāsudeva the poet. The date of the author can therefore be between 900 and 1400 A. D. The *Nalodaya* is wrongly ascribed to the authorship of Kālidāsa. A commentator on the *Nalodaya* ascribes it to one Ravidāsa.

Agastya was a poet in the court of King Pratāparudradeva of Warangal (1294—1325 A. D.). Tradition makes him the author of seventy-four *kāvya*s, some of which are available. He was awarded by his patron the title *Vidyānātha*. He wrote a poem *Bālabhāratha* in twenty cantos on the life of the Pāṇḍavas. It abounds in the fine graces of the *Vaidarbhī* style.

Vedāntadeśika (1268—1369 A. D.), whose real name was Veṅkaṭa-nātha, was a great poet and philosopher. He wrote nearly 120 works, on various subjects of study in *Saṃskṛta* and *Tamil*. He was a native of Kāñcī and was a follower of the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* school of Rāmānuja. His life was of unceasing literary activity. He is the author of a poem *Yādavābhyudaya* in twenty-four cantos describing the story of Kṛṣṇa. He takes up each and every incident in the life of Kṛṣṇa and gives them a poetic touch with a philosophical back ground. The aerial view of the land is described in the eighteenth canto which gives an account of the death of the demon Naraka at the hands of Kṛṣṇa and of Kṛṣṇa's return to Dvāraka from the capital of the demon. The sixth canto contains a display in *Sabdālaṅkāra* after the manner of Bhāravi and Māgha. The author displays considerable variety of style. He was awarded for his erudition the titles, Vedāntācārya, Kavitārkikasiṃha and Sarvatantrasvatantra. This poem was commented by Appayadīkṣita (c. 1600 A. D.).

Gaṅgādevi, wife of Kampana, the second son of Bukka I (1343—1379 A. D.) of Vijayanagar, wrote a poem *Mathurāvijaya* or *Vīra-kamparāyacarita* which is now available in fragments. She describes the exploits of her husband and of his expedition to the south. Kampana visited Madura and killed the ruler of that town and hence the title

1. Yamakakavi Vāsudeva by V. Venkatarama Sarma : Proceedings and Transactions of the Tenth Oriental Conference.

Mathurāvijaya The date of the authoress may be fixed about 1380 A. D. About 1400 A. D. Lolambaraja, who was a poet under Harihara of Vijayanagar, wrote a poem *Harivilāsa* in five cantos about Kṛṣṇa and his exploits.

Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa was the son of Komaṭiyajvan of Vatsagotra. He was the pupil of Vidyāraṇya. He was a poet in the court of Peddakomaṭ Vemabhūpala (1403 – 1420 A. D.) of Addanki. His date may therefore be fixed in the first half of the 15th century A. D. He is the author of a poem *Raghunāthacarita* in thirty cantos on Rāma's life and of *Nalābhyudaya* a poem in eight cantos on the life of Nala.

Kalhana's *Rājataranginī* was continued by Jonarāja (1450 A. D.) from Jayasimha to Sultan Zainu-l-abidin. Jonarāja's pupil Śrīvara continued his master's work in his *Jainarājataranginī* covering the period upto 1486 A. D. Prājyabhaṭṭa, a later writer, wrote the *Rājāvalīpatākā* writing the history of Kāshmir from this period up to the annexation of Kashmir by Akbar.

Sukumāarakavi (c. 1450 A. D.) a poet of Malabar wrote a poem *Kṛṣṇavilāsa* in four cantos on Kṛṣṇa's exploits. The elegance and simplicity of style has made it one of the most popular poems of Malabar.

Rājanātha II, who had the title Diṇḍimakavisarvabhauma, was patronised by the royal families of Vijayanagar. He was a favourite of Sālva Narasiṃha, the leader of the forces of the Vijayanagar kings. About 1430 A. D., he wrote the *Sāluvābhyudaya* a poem in thirteen cantos describing the achievements of Sālva Narasiṃha and his ancestors. His grandson Rājanātha III wrote about 1540 A. D. the *Acyutarāyābhyudaya* a poem in twenty cantos on the exploits of King Acyutarāya (1530-42 A. D.), the brother of Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagar.

Rāmacandra, son of Lakṣmanabhaṭṭa wrote in 1542 A. D. a poem *Rasikarañjana* belonging to the *drisandhāna* type. When read in one way, the poem gives an erotic sense and in the other it extols asceticism.

Utpreksāvallabha, a native of Malabar, wrote a poem *Bhikṣāṭana-kārya* which is incomplete in thirty-nine sections called *paddhati*. It describes how Śiva went as a beggar asking for alms to a Cola king whose liberality he wanted to test. The name of the author is not given in the text. The word *Śirabhaktadāsa* which occurs in the poem may refer to his name but it is only a surmise. The title 'Utpreksāvallabha' appears to have been conferred on the author in appreciation of the flights of his fancy. The date of the work is also not known. The critics, however, place him about the 16th century A. D.

Rudrakavi wrote the *Rāṣṭraudha-amśamahākārya* a poem in twenty cantos about the history of the family of Nārāyaṇshah the

ruler of Mayūragiri from the first king Raṣṭraudha. The poet, who was patronised by Nārāyaṇshah, wrote the poem in 1596 A. D.

About the year 1600 A. D., Cidambara wrote the *Rāgharapāṇḍa-vayāḍavīya* a poem of the *trisaṇdhāna* types. He tells the stories of Rāma, Pāṇḍavas and Kṛṣṇa in one and the same work by the use of the same stanzas.

Yajñanārāyaṇa was the son of Govindadīkṣita who was the prime minister of the Nayak kings of Tanjore, Acyuta (1577 - 1614 A. D.) and Raghunātha who came to the throne after Acyuta. Yajñanārāyaṇa was patronised by Raghunātha. His date may be fixed about 1600 A. D. He wrote the *Raghunāthabhūparijaya* also called *Sāhityaratnākara* a poem in sixteen cantos describing the life of his patron.

Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita was the son of Ratnakheṭa Śrīnivaśadīkṣita a contemporary of Appayadīkṣita. He was patronised by Raghunātha king of Tanjore. He lived about 1620 A. D. He is the author of a number of works on different subjects. His *Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa* is a poem in ten cantos describing the marriage of Rukmiṇī with Kṛṣṇa. His style is simple and graceful.

Ramabhadrāmbā, the queen of Raghunātha, was a poetess of high order. She considered her husband as Śrī Rāma incarnate and wrote a poem *Raghunāthābhyaudaya* in twelve cantos glorifying the achievements of her husband. Raghunātha himself was a poet of a high order. He is said to have been the author of a number of works.

Cakrakavi is the author of the *Jānakīpariṇaya* a poem in eight cantos describing the marriage of Sītā with Rāma. He was patronised by Tirumala Nayak of Madura. His date is to be fixed about 1650 A. D.

Nilakaṇṭhadīkṣita was the grandson of the brother of Appayadīkṣita. He was born in 1613 A. D. He studied under Veṅkaṭeśvaramakhin, son of Govindadīkṣita. He was the prime minister of Tirumala Nayak of Madura. The period of his literary activities may be fixed about 1650 A. D. He is the author of a number of works of elegant style and good taste. His poems are the *Śivalīlārṇava* and *Gaṅgāvataraṇa*. The former has twenty-two cantos and describes the sixty-four sports of Hālāśyanātha under which name Śiva is worshipped at Madura. The latter has eight cantos describing the descent of the R. Gaṅgā.

Veṅkaṭadhvarin was a native of Kāñcī and belonged to the school Rāmānuja. He was a great poet and philosopher. He lived about 1650 A. D. His poem is the *Yādararāgharīya* in thirty stanzas with the author's own commentary on it. It belongs to the *drisaṇdhāna* type of poems. The poem is made extremely hard to be understood by the introduction of alliteration in the use of which the author was a master.

Meghavijayagaṇi a Jain monk wrote in 1671 A. D. the *Saptasandhānamahākāvya* a poem in nine cantos giving an account of the lives of Vṛṣabhanātha, Śāntinātha, Pārśvanātha, Neminātha, Mahāvīrasvāmin, Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva. Each stanza gives the story of all these seven persons. His work is on the model of the *dvisandhāna* type of poems composed by Dhanañjaya, Kavirāja and others. Besides this work, he wrote works on the lives of the Jain saints and on the Jain system of philosophy.

Devavimalagaṇi, a Jain, wrote the *Hīrasaubhāgya* a poem in seventeen cantos with his own commentary on it. It describes the life of Hīravijayasūri who was awarded the title Jagadguru by Akbar. He wrote the work about 1700 A. D.

Rāmabhadradīkṣita is the author of the *Patañjalicarita* a poem in eight cantos describing the life of Patañjali the grammarian. He was an ardent devotee of Śrī Rāma. He was patronised by King Shahaji of Tanjore (1684-1711 A. D.). The period of his literary activities may be fixed about 1700 A. D.

In the first half of the 18th century A. D. Haradattasūri wrote the *Rāgha anaiṣadhīya* a poem in two cantos describing the lives of Rāma and Nala in the *dvisandhāna* type.

The period of the *Kāvya* literature taken as a whole has a rich development. Three periods are noticed in the development of the *kāvya* literature viz., Pre-Kālidāsan, Kālidāsan and Post-Kālidāsan. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is the only work representing the Pre-Kālidāsan period. Owing to Kālidāsa's eminence as a poet, the names of other poets and their works were forgotten. During this period importance was attached to sense and the form of the poem received only secondary consideration. This was very helpful for the development of the creative faculty of the poets. Kalidasa and his immediate followers belong to the second period in which both sense and form received good treatment resulting in the sense assuming an appropriate form. The creative faculty of the poets worked hand in hand with the literary embellishments. In this period, there appears a sign of deterioration in the works of Aśvaghoṣa who followed Kālidāsa.

The third period has many outstanding features. The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana and the works on poetics have profoundly influenced the works written during this period and made the works artificial and stereotyped. A poet had to satisfy his patron and a cultivated audience. His work was to stand the test of expert judges. In the works of these poets, who aimed at popularity in these surroundings, 'sentimentality replace sentiment, fancy predominated over passion and ingenuity took the place of feeling.' With the decline in importance attached to creative faculty, form began to occupy a prominent position and therefore matter was given secondary importance. This

was made possible at the great sacrifice of sense. The poets began to compete with each other in displaying mere bombast and play on words. As a result of the rules laid down for a *Mahākāvya*, certain descriptions which could not be justified for their inclusion in certain poems, were forced into their body. Ratnākara's *Haravijaya*, Mañkha's *Srīkaṇṭhacarita* and Śivasvāmin's *Kappaṇābhyaudaya* are some of the works which prove this tendency. The poets began to show their originality in *Sabdālāṅkāras*. Bhāravi, Māgha, Kumāradāsa, Vāsudeva, Śivasvāmin, and deserve Veṅkaṭādhvarin are some among the writers worth notice in this connection. The growing influence of the grammarians is felt in the works of some writers. Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita*, and Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* illustrate this. Some writers like Bhaṭṭi, Bhīma, and Halāyudha wrote their works with the sole purpose of giving in their works the illustrations for the rules of grammar. As the poems became more and more formative, some writers like Śrīharṣa began to show their skill in fields other than poetry. A new tendency in the use of pun arose resulting in the writing of a poem on more than one theme. Dhanañjaya's *Dvisandhāna*, Kavirāja's *Rāghavapāṇḍaviya* and others deserve mention in this connection. Dr. A. B. Keith aptly remarks that the puns 'have a fatal effect on language ; if a double sense is to be expressed, it is impossible for the best of poets to avoid straining meanings, constructions, and word order. The effort leads to constant ransacking of the poetical lexicons extant and turns the pursuit of poetry into an intellectual exercise of no high value to the utter ruin of emotion and thought.'¹ Sectarianism played a prominent part during this period. The Buddhists and the Jains have contributed much to the *kāvya* literature. Aśvaghoṣa and Hemacandra are the outstanding writers of poetry from this point of view. History too was written in the form of poems. Kalhaṇa, Bilhaṇa and others were the prominent writers in this branch. The *Prākṛta* language came to be used for literary purposes. Pravarasena's *Setubandha* stands prominent among the poems written in *Prākṛta*.

North India has been a strong hold for poets. South India gained prominence through her poets during the period of the Āndhrabhr̥tya, Valabhī and other dynasties. Countless Jain poets flourished in Gujarat for nearly three centuries from about the 10th century. These poets had a fascination for the stories of the Māhabhārata. Till the 6th century A. D. the regions to the south of Deccan did not produce *Saṁskṛta* poets. After this date, the Pallavas, the Cālukyas the Ceras, the Colas, the Pāṇdyas, and the kings of Vijayanagar, of Tanjore and Madura encouraged *Saṁskṛta* poets. From the 8th century A. D. onwards, Malabar produced down to the 19th century A. D. innumerable poets. A separate work is needed to record the achievements of the poets who lived during this period, in Malabar,

1. A. B. Keith : History of Sanskrit Literature P. 127.

Vijayanagar, Tanjore, Kāñcī and Madura. The illustrious descendants of Appayadīkṣita and those connected with them by matrimony have made valuable contributions to the field of the *kāvya*s. Another feature of this period is the rise of poetesses. Till the advent of the British, the poets flourished under the princes. With the disappearance of the princes, consequent on the establishment of the British rule, literary pursuits were not encouraged by anybody and therefore began to decline gradually.

CHAPTER XIV

THE LYRICS

The word 'lyric' is related to the word lyre which denotes an instrument of music in the European countries. A lyric therefore means a literary piece which is sung to the accompaniment of a lyre. A lyric is an expression of a feeling, thought or sentiment whether it be of love, grief or devotion. It is an out-pouring of the human heart. Its expression is spontaneous. It has an emotional appeal, more emotional than a poem. In the *Sanskṛta* literature, the lyrics are not of considerable length. In size, they vary from one stanza to a work containing a number of stanzas. What is expressed in a lyrical piece is complete in itself. The animals and plants play a prominent part in the Indian lyrics. The author of the lyrics draws instances for comparison from the cakora, cakravāka, cātaka and from the lotus, creepers and other plants. The lyrics are called *Khaṇḍakāvya* as they are in form *Kāvyas* though not fully. These lyrics have influenced the writers of the West. Heinrich Heine, a German poet of the first half of the 19th century, wrote a lyric *Auf Flügeln des Gesanges*.

The origin of the lyrical compositions can be traced to the Vedic period. Vālmīki's utterance of the curse can be styled a lyric. Two main divisions are made in the lyrical literature *viz.*, Erotic and Religious.

THE EROTIC LYRICS.

The lyrical compositions of the erotic type are available in various forms. Among them, the *Sandēśa* type is one of the best in use. In this type of composition, the message is sent by the lover to his beloved from whom he is separated. The message is sent through a messenger whom the lover is in a mood to choose. In some works of this type, the lady too sends a message to her lover.

Among the *Sandēśakāvyas* and lyrics in general, the *Meghasandēśa* of Kālidāsa is the best. It is also called *Meghadūta* and it is of two parts called *pūrvamegha* and *uttaramegha*. In the first part, it is told how a Yakṣa, who was separated from his beloved at Alakā, had to live at Rāmagiri hill. At the advent of the rainy season, he desires to send his wife a message comforting her in her distress and informing her of his condition. He looks at a cloud which is clinging to the top of a hill near by. He begins to address the cloud. After extending welcome to it, he gives it the route it has to take to Alakā. In the latter part, he describes the city Alakā, gives the marks to identify his residence there and after describing the plight of his beloved, gives the cloud the message to be delivered.

It is held by a section of the critics that Kālidāsa wrote this poem under the pretext of expressing his personal experience. This view may not be wholly wrong but does not deserve acceptance since no evidence is available which could throw light on his life. The source of the poem, therefore, is to be sought in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The expressions used by the poet give a hint as regards the source. Sugrīva's directions to the monkeys about the routes, description of Laṅkā, Hanumān's entry into Laṅkā in the evening, Sītā's description in the Aśokavana and Hanumān's meeting with Sītā in the early morning appear to have a bearing on this lyric of Kālidāsa¹.

Kālidāsa has clothed this lyric with feelings. The description of the Yakṣa's wife and her plight clearly tells how the poet had studied the workings of the feelings in the human heart especially during eventful periods. He had noticed the delicate and nice shades and feelings of the human beings and Nature. The animals and the plants were as much endowed with the power to express their feelings as the human beings and hence the poet blends the human world with the world of Nature. This is made clear in his description of the cloud and its journey. His style is chaste, dignified and polished. He has brought out clearly that love in separation has its own advantages and is the indispensable factor which purifies the love between man and woman. The route which is described reveals Kālidāsa's geographical knowledge of the country and his understanding of the people and their ways. The poet has chosen the *Mandākrāntā* metre for the entire work and has handled it with success. Kṣemendra² (1050 A. D.) refers to Kālidāsa, as having handled with success this metre which suits the theme.³ The work is now available in about 115 stanzas. Some commentators have treated, as genuine, some more stanzas which are considered to be spurious.

The *Meghasandēśa* has won universal admiration. It has greatly impressed the poets of the West. Schiller (C. 1800 A. D.) the German poet has, on the model of Kālidāsa's lyric, composed his *Maria Stuart* in which the captive queen bids the clouds greet the land of France where she spent her youth.

The influence of the *Meghasandēśa* on later poets is very great.

-
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. cf. <i>Meghadūta uttarabhāga</i> | <i>Rāmāyaṇa Sundarakāṇḍa</i> |
| Verse 37 | canto XXII 17 and 18 |
| „ 36 & 38 | „ LIII 2 |
| „ 48 | „ 38 Kākāśura incident |
2. सुवशा कालिदासस्य मण्डाक्रान्ता प्रवर्तते । *Suvṛttatilaka* III. 33.
3. माहृद्मवासव्यसने मण्डाक्रान्ता विराजते ।

It served as the model for imitation of its form and theme at their hands. One type of their attempt at imitation was to compose the stanzas incorporating in them one or more lines from each stanza of Kālidāsa's lyric. Through this attempt, the text of the *Meghasandēśa* came to be preserved. Jinasena, who lived about 814 A. D., wrote a poem *Pārśvābhyudaya* in four cantos describing the life of a Jain saint Pārśvanātha. In this work are preserved 120 stanzas of the *Meghasandēśa*. Vikrama of unknown date wrote the *Nemidūta* describing the life of Neminātha a Jain saint. His text preserves 125 stanzas of Kālidāsa's lyric.

The other type was to imitate the form of the lyric for a similar or different purpose. Dhoyī, who was a poet in the court of King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (C. 1169 A. D.) wrote, in imitation of the *Meghasandēśa* the *Pavanadūta* describing the message of love sent through the wind by a Gandharva maiden to King Lakṣmaṇasena, the poet's patron. Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A. D.) wrote the *Hamsasandēśa* in imitation of the *Meghasandēśa*. He describes the message of Rāma sent through a swan to Sītā at Laṅkā after Hanumān brought him the news about Sītā. The idea of choosing the swan as a messenger might have been suggested by the swan's service as a messenger to Nala and Damayantī. Kālidāsa's influence is felt at almost every stage. Along with the element of love, the devotional element characterises this lyric. To achieve this purpose of laying stress on the importance of devotion the author describes the sacred places in the Tamil land. This lyric, which contains 110 verses, is an admirable imitation of Kālidāsa's lyric. Uddanda (C. 1400 A. D.) a poet, who was born in Tamil land, went to Malabar to seek his fortune and became a poet under the Zamorin of Calicut. He imitated the lyric of Kālidāsa in his *Kokilasandēśa* on a love message which is a fine imitation of the *Meghasandēśa*. Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa (1420 A. D.) is the author of the *Hamsasandēśa* in pure imitation of the lyric of Kālidāsa. Rūpagosvāmin, (1500 A. D.) the pupil of Kṛṣṇacaitanya, is the author of two *sandēśakāvyas* *Hamsadūta* and *Uddharasandēśa* both laying stress on devotion. Rāma Sīstrin of Mysore wrote in the 19th century *Meghapratisandēśa* describing the message sent through the cloud by the Yakṣa's wife in reply to the Yakṣa's message. Besides, there are a number of lyrics of inferior value. Some of them were written purely to stress on devotional Pūrṇasarasvatī, whose identity is not established, wrote the *Hamsasandēśa* which contains the message sent by a woman at Kāñcī to Śrī Kṛṣṇa at Br̥ṇḍāvana. Some of them like the *Kokasandēśa* of Viṣṇutrātā (16th century A. D.) which includes alliteration and the *Bhṛṅgasandēśa* of Vāsudeva (17th century A. D.) contain more than two hundred verses. Some are composed in metres other than the *Mandākrāntā*, for instance the *Candradūta* of

Vinayaprabha (before 1300 A. D.) is composed in the *Mālinī* the *Manodūta* of Viṣṇudāsa of unknown date in the *Vasantatilaka* and the *Manodūta* of Rāmārama of unknown date in the *Śikharinī*.

Ghaṭakarpara wrote *Ghaṭakarparakāvya* a lyric in twenty-two stanzas describing how a young wife sends a message to her lover through a cloud. This lyric is full of alliteration of the *yamaka* type. In the last verse he avowes to carry water in a broken jar to the man who surpasses him. Hence he acquired the name Ghaṭakarpara and his lyric is called after his name. No information, except the nine-gem theory, is available about his identity Abhinavagupta (C 1000 A. D.) who commented on this, attributes this lyric to Kālidāsa¹.

Apart from the *sandēśa* type, there is no set form for the lyrics. The *Rtusamhāra* is a lyric in 144 stanzas describing the six seasons of the year in six cantos. The opinion of the scholars is divided about its authorship. The Indian scholars while recognising the fact that it is attributed to Kālidāsa do not support this attribution on the grounds that the Indian commentators of repute have ignored this work while they have commented on the other works of Kālidāsa and that the rhetoricians have not cited even a single line from this work. The scholars of the West, who hold the opposite view, meet this criticism by saying that the comparative simplicity of the work did not give rise to the need for the writing of a commentary on it and that the rhetoricians 'never exhibit the slightest trace of liking for what is simple.' They further hold that 'if the poem were denied him, his reputation would suffer real loss.' It is true that this lyric contains traces of having been produced from Kālidāsa's pen. There are also many other works which contain these traces but are known definitely to have been from other poets. The use of an obscure form² in this poem and the absence of similar ones in the other works of Kālidāsa do not favour the authorship of Kālidāsa to this lyric.

The *Śṛṅgāratilaka* is a lyric in thirty-one verses describing the phases of love. On the same theme is the *Puṣpabāṇavilāsa* in twenty-six fine verses. The *Rākṣasakāvya* is a lyric in twenty stanzas describing the forest sites through a lover who roams about with his beloved. It is full of alliterations. All these three lyrics are attributed to the authorship of Kālidāsa.

Amaru or Amaruka is the author of a lyric *Amaruśataka* containing one hundred elegant verses on the various phases of love. The

1. Abhinavagupta : An Historical and Philosophical study by K. C. Pandey, P. 65.

2. सोऽयं वो वितरीतरीतु वितनुभद्रं वसन्ताम्बितः *Rtusamhāra* VI 28.

delineation of the various aspects of love is very realistic and highly imaginative. The work has come down in four recensions and only fifty-one verses are found common between them. It is quoted by Vamana (800 A. D.) and Ānandavardhana (850 A. D.). Therefore it must have been written before 800 A. D. Its authorship is wrongly ascribed to Śaṅkara, the greatest exponent of *Advaita*. Bhartṛhari is the author of the *Śṛṅgāraśataka* containing one hundred lyrical verses on the various aspects of love. The author does not conclude, unlike many others, that love is the final object of human pursuit. He is identified with the grammarian Bhartṛhari and with Bhartṛhari the half brother of one Vikramāditya. This identification lacks confirmation. Bilhana (1080 A. D.), the author of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, wrote the *Caurapīṇcāśikā* a lyric containing fifty verses. It is said that the author was in love with the daughter of his patron who, scenting the guilt of the poet, ordered the poet to be hanged and that the poet composed this lyric while he was being lead away in the presence of his patron who was moved by the genuine pathos contained in the lyric and ordered the poet to be released. The lyric is in the form of the lover's recollections of the pleasures he had in the company of his beloved.

Jayadeva was one of the poets patronised by King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal, (circa 1169 A. D.)¹ the others being Dhoyī, Umāpatidhara, Śaraṇa and Govardhana. Jayadeva must have lived about 1200 A. D. He is the author of a lyric *Gītagovinda* containing twelve cantos. It describes the love of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā in the form of conversation between Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā and the latter's companion. In some places, it becomes a lyrical monologue. The stanzas are grouped into sets each set containing eight verses. Hence the work came to be called the *Aṣṭapadī*. The musical notes are given for each set which is to be sung. 'The recitative and the song, narrative, description and speeches are cunningly interwoven, all with deliberate purpose.' It is said to represent the stage of transition between pure drama and pure lyric. It touches all the phases of love. The Indian commentators, give an allegorical interpretation to this love aspect of the lyric. Kṛṣṇa stands for the Supreme Being, and Rādhā for the individual soul. The work treats with the relationship of husband and wife (*nāyakanayakābhāva*) as existing between God and the souls. This lyric, primarily erotic in significance, has become very popular mainly due to this interpretation. It has numberless ardent admirers all over the country and is sung on occasions of worship. The Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa form of worship owes its popularity to this lyric. Although its value as a devotional lyric cannot be minimised, its value as an erotic lyric is greater. It has many commentaries and has a German translation by Rückert.

1. Collected works of R. G. Bhandarkar Vol. II, P. 346.

THE RELIGIOUS LYRICS

The religious lyrics form an important part of the lyrical literature. More than the literature in the other branches, these religious lyrics have a wider appeal and they have been greatly responsible in keeping the fire of religion from becoming extinguished. The spiritual progress made by the various religions in India has been mainly due to them. The Buddhists and the Jains have their own religious lyrics produced as a result of the influence of the Hindu religious lyrics. The purpose of these has been to wean the human mind from the material pleasures and prosperity to which it is accustomed by age-long association and to direct it in the path of wisdom and devotion to the Supreme Being. The tendency to lay emphasis on the necessity of practising devotion has given rise to the production of the religious lyrics. These lyrics, which are also philosophical in outlook, are in the form of verses, *pañcaka* of five verses, *aṣṭaka* of eight, *daśaka* of ten, *pañcāśat* of fifty *śataka* of hundred and so on. Most of them are metrical. Some are *daṇḍakas* in prose form with words having a musical setting and which have division. Some are *gadyas* which are in prose form and are set to music. Their origin may be traced to the Vedic period and the epic period. Countless are these religious lyrics. In most cases, their authors are not known.

Kālidāsa is said to be the author of some devotional lyrics. The authorship of the *Syāmalādaṇḍaka* is attributed to him. Aśvaghoṣa (1st century A. D.) wrote the *Gāṇḍīstotragāthā* a lyric which contained the religious message conveyed by the beating of a long piece of wood with a short club. Siddhasenadivākara a Jain, who lived about 500 A. D., wrote the *Kalyāṇamandirastotra* in praise of the Jain Tīrthaṅkaras. King Harṣa is said to be the author of the *Suprabhāta-stotra* and *Aṣṭamahāśrīcaityastotra* which are Buddhistic in spirit. Bāṇa (600 A. D.) is the author of the *Caṇḍīśataka* containing one hundred verses on Caṇḍī, consort of Śiva. Mānatuṅga is said to have been the author of the *Bhāktāmarastotra* in praise of the gods. He was a contemporary of Harṣa and therefore his date may be fixed in the first half of the 7th century. Mayūra is considered as the father-in-law of Bāṇa. He was patronised by King Harṣa. He is the author of the *Sūryaśataka* in praise of the sun written in the *Gauḍī* style. The *Sragdharāstotra*, which is in praise of Tārā a favourite deity of the theistic school of Buddhism, was composed by Sarvajñamitra of unknown date.

A number of religious lyrics, which are noted for the depth of

of devotion, is attributed to Śaṅkara the great Advaitin (632-664 A. D.)¹ The authorship of all these cannot be settled for want of definite information. Some critics are not willing to attribute all these lyrics to the authorship of the same philosopher. In their opinion, the lyrics like the *Saundaryalaharī* could not have been written by Śaṅkara, as these lyrics prescribe the worship of Śakti in accordance with the *Śākta Āgamas* whose authority, Śaṅkara, denounces in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. Tradition, however recognises Śaṅkara as the author of this *Saundaryalaharī*. The position about the authorship of these lyrics cannot be clearly stated. Śaṅkara must have written a number of them while the rest could have been composed by the heads of the Mutts who too had the title Śaṅkarāchārya. Among the lyrics which are recognised to be his, the following deserve mention in the context. They are the *Annapūrṇādaśaka Annapūrṇāṣṭaka*, *Kanakadhārāstava*, *Dakṣiṇāmūrtyaṣṭaka*, *Rāmabhujaṅgastotra*, *Lakṣmīnṛsiṃhastotra*, *Viṣṇupādā-dikeśāntavarṇana*, *Śivabhujaṅgastotra*, *Śivānandalaharī*, and *Saundaryalaharī*.

The *Mukundamālā*, a lyric in praise of Viṣṇu, was composed by Kulasekhara, a King of Kerala. He is identified with Kulasekhara Alvar a Vaisnavite saint. The date of the author is given as 700 A. D. The devotional element gets great stress in this lyric whose style is chaste, direct and markedly simple.

Mūka was probably a contemporary of Śaṅkara and was born dumb. Through the favour of Goddess Kāmākṣī at Kāñcī, he got the power of speech which he utilised in praising the Goddess in the *Mūkapañcāśatī* containing of five-hundred melodious verses. In the first half of the 9th century A. D. Puṣpadanta of Kashmir wrote the *Mahimnastava* in praise of Śiva. Ratnākara, the author of the poem *Haravijaya*, wrote the *Vakroktipañcāśikā* containing fifty stanzas in the form of conversation between Śiva and Pārvatī. The lyric is full of turns of expressions (*vakrokti*) which reveal the author's ingenuity. Anandavardhana, who was patronised by Avantivarman of Kashmir (about 850 A. D.), wrote the *Devīsataka* on Pārvatī. It is melodious notwithstanding the abundant use of the *Śabdālankāras* in it. Utpaladeva (C. 925), preceptor of Abhinavagupta is the author of the *Stotrāvalī* a collection of the hymns in praise of Śiva composed by himself.

Yāmuna was the preceptor of Rāmānuja's preceptor. He lived

1. Śaṅkara is wrongly assigned by the critics of the West has to the period 788-820 A. D. The correct dates of Śaṅkara and of the scholars of his period are given by Mahamahopādhyāya S. Kuppaswami Sastri in his Introduction to the *Brahmasiddhi* of Maṇḍanamisra.

about 1000 A. D. He is the author of the two lyrics *Catuslokī* and *Stotraratna*. The former is in praise of Goddess Lakṣmī and the latter in praise of Viṣṇu. The former has four verses and the latter sixty-five. These two lyrics are noted for the depth of feeling and emotion. Rāmānuja (1017-1125 A. D.), the greatest exponent of the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, is the author of the lyric in *gadya* form, *Gadyatraya* consisting of *Saraṇagātigadya*, *Vaikunṭhagadya* and *Śrīraṅgagadya*. These are noted for their emotional appeal. Śrīvatsāṅka was one of the chief disciples of Rāmānuja. He is the author of the *Pañcastava* a collection of five lyrics *Śrīstava*, *Atimānuṣa-stava*, *Varadarājastava*, *Sundarabāhustava* and *Vaikunṭhastava*, all by himself. These reveal the author as a poet of polished verses and high imagination. Parāśarabhaṭṭa was the worthy son of Śrīvatsāṅka. He lived about 1100 A. D. Among his lyrics, the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* and the *Śrīguṇaratnakōṣa* are the most famous.

Jayadeva, the author of the *Gītagovinda*, wrote a lyric *Gaṅgāstava*. The *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva, though primarily erotic, is treated by some scholars, as a devotional lyric. The same is the case with the *Kṛṣṇakarnāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka whose original name was Bilva-maṅgala. In three sections, it contains 310 verses. The erotic element is not so prominent in this lyric as in the *Gītagovinda*. He is considered to have been a native of Malabar. According to some scholars, the author, who was a philosopher and poet, lived in the latter half of the 8th century A. D., and according to others, lived in the 12th century A. D. The work gives vivid pictures of the sports of Śrīkṛṣṇa. The popularity of the lyric has spread far and wide in the land. The *Caitanya* movement in Bengal was greatly influenced in its origin and progress by this lyric.

Anandatīrtha, well-known as Madhva, (1199-1277 A. D.), who was the great exponent of the *Dvaita* system, wrote a number of works among which the well-known lyric is the *Dvādaśastotra*.

Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A. D.) wrote twenty-five lyrics which reveal his sincerity of devotion and command over the *Saṁskṛta* language. The *Pādukāśahasra* has one thousand verses in praise of Śrī Rama's sandals. These verses, it is held, were composed by the author, in a single night to meet the challenge from a rival. This lyric is a fine product of the poet's flights of fancy. The *Garudadaṇḍaka* is in praise of the bird Garuḍa. The *Raghuvīragadya* is in the *gadya* form and is in praise of Śrī Rāma. These two lyrics show the author's skill in the different forms of composition. His *Acyuta-śataka* in praise of Viṣṇu consists of one hundred verses written in *Prakṛta*. The other lyrics are smaller in size but equally great by the loftiness of sentiment and expression.

Appayadīkṣita, a native of Kāñcī, who was born in 1554 A. D., is the author of a number of works representing all branches of study. His *Varadarājastava* is in praise of God Varadarāja at Kāñcī. This has one hundred verses together with the author's commentary on them. The lyric brings out clearly the greatness of the author as a poet gifted with originality and imagination.

Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Meppathur in Kerala was an inspired poet and versatile scholar. His works are many and among his lyrics the *Nārāyaṇīyam* is the best. It was written in 1585 A. D. when the author was miraculously cured of his rheumatic attack while he was engaged in the worship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa at Guruvayoor in Kerala. The *Nārāyaṇīyam* is in praise of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is in the form of a summary of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. It has 1036 verses grouped under twelve *skandhas*. It is held in veneration in Malabar. Like the *Bhāgavata*, it is used for daily recitation.

Madhusūdanasarasvatī, who lived about 1600 A. D., wrote the *Anandamandākinī* which describes Śrī Kṛṣṇa from foot to head. Rūpagosvāmin the pupil of Kṛṣṇa Caitanya wrote a number of works. The *Gandharvapṛarthanāṣṭaka* and *Mukundamuktāvali* are the famous among his lyrics. Jagannātha Paṇḍita (1590-1665 A. D.) was patronised by Emperor Shah Jehan. He is the author of five lyrics *Sudhālaharī*, *Amṛtalaharī*, *Lakṣmīlaharī*, *Karuṇālaharī* and *Gaṅgālaharī*. The *Sudhālaharī* has thirty verses in praise of the sun, *Amṛtalaharī* ten verses in praise of the River Yamunā, *Lakṣmīlaharī* forty-one verses in praise of Goddess Lakṣmī, *Karuṇālaharī* also known as *Viṣṇulaharī* forty-three verses in praise of Viṣṇu and *Gaṅgālaharī* which is also known as *Piyūṣalaharī* fifty-two verses in praise of the River Gaṅgā. Among these, the last two mentioned are the best in form and expression. Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (C. 1650 A. D.) is the author of two lyrics *Anandasāgarastava* and *Śivotkarṣamañjarī* respectively on the state of bliss attained by one through his devotion to Pārvatī and the eminence of Śiva as the Supreme Deity. Venkaṭādhvarin (C. 1650 A. D.) is the author of the *Lakṣmīsahasra* a lyrical poem in praise of Lakṣmī and Viṣṇu in one thousand verses. All the verses are very terse and reveal the author's skill in producing a laboured style and in soaring to great heights of fancy. Rāmabhadradīkṣita (1700 A. D.), unrivalled in his devotion to Śrī Rāma, is the author of about ten lyrics all in praise of Rāma. The *Rāmabāṇastava* in praise of Rāma's arrows and the *Adbhuta-sītārāmastotra* eloquent in praise of Rāma and Sītā are the two lyrics from among these. Nārāyaṇatīrtha (C. 1700 A. D.), an ascetic, is the author of the *Kṛṣṇalīlātarāṅgiṇi* in twelve *tarāṅgas*. They describe the sports of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. They are set to music and sung to various tunes. Noted for the depth of feeling, sincerity of

devotion and melody in expression are the compositions of Tyāgarāja, Syāmā Sāstrin and Muthusvāmi dīkṣita who formed the trinity of musicians and composers of the lyrics in South India in the last century.

CHAPTER XV

THE GNOMIC AND DIDACTIC POETRY

The gnomes are short pithy maxims on morals. These are based on the facts of general truth drawn from experience. Generally, they deal with the rules of conduct. The didactic poems were intended to be used for giving instructions. There is, however, no clear line of demarcation between gnostic and didactic poetry. A work supposed to be didactic contains the features of the gnostic poetry and vice-versa.

This type of poetry had been in existence from very early times. The influences of religion and philosophy are clearly seen in the growth and development of this poetry. The sufferings of the soul, due to series of birth and deaths, gave rise to the desire for the search of truth. Pain and pleasure were studied and their place in life was fixed. The values of virtue and vice were taken into account while pursuing the path of progress. Stress is to be laid on the good and bad aspects of life and on the good and bad who influence, not in a small measure, the life of the people. Naturally the rules of good and bad conducts are given with illustrations. These poems, therefore, extol the need for the spirit of tolerance and brotherhood. Love of mankind is to be extended to the beasts and birds also. Detachment and asceticism are praised. Instances for instructing these principles are freely drawn from the human and animal worlds. True friendship, chaste women and self-sacrificers receive good treatment at the hands of the writers of this type of poetry. On the otherhand, what is conducive to the development of vice is condemned in a downright manner. The women, in general, receive bad treatment. Pedantry and spurious learning are condemned. The defects of misery and poverty together with their adverse effects on men and their life are duly recognised and recorded. The inscrutable ways of fate are clearly shown and illustrated, but human endeavour, it is held, must rise up to the occasion, for it is the necessary complement of fate. The subjects dealt with in this poetry belong therefore to the spheres of religion, philosophy, morals and politics. The Hindus, the Buddhist and the Jains have contributed their might to enrich this poetry in form beauty and quality. This poetry can be called ethical poetry.

Like the lyrics, this poetry also is of different forms. They are metrical and their size ranges from one stanza to a work containing a number of stanzas. These were introduced into the fables for the sake of effect in the context. Some among them were handed down without being recorded in any particular work. The result of this kind of growth of this poetry was the inclusion of stray stanzas into definite text books. Very often the authors of these stanzas are forgotten. One and the same stanza is found included in different works.

The origin of this poetry may be traced to the *R̥gveda* and the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*. The *Mahābhārata* is rich in the collection of verses of this type. The earliest collection of such verses goes by the name of *Cāṇakyaśataka* which consists of 340 stanzas. It deals with the rules of conduct in a general way. It is not clear whether Cāṇakya, the minister of Chandragupta Maurya, would have been its author. There are treatises like the *Rājanītisamuccaya*, *Vṛddhacāṇakya* and others which are of similar type. The *Dhammapāda* represents the attempt of the Buddhists at the composition of this poetry for the use of men of their faith.

The earliest text about which some authentic information is available is the *Nitidviṣaṣṭikā* of Sundarapāṇḍya. It contains 116 verses of didactic nature. The verses from this work are quoted by the authors of the anthologies without mentioning the source. Janāśraya (600 A. D.) quotes a line from this work in his *Chandoviciti*. Sundarapāṇḍya's passages, from his other works which he wrote but are now lost, are quoted by Kumārila (650 A. D.) and Śaṅkara. He must have been a native of Madura and his date may be fixed about 500 A.D¹. Sāntideva, who lived about 600 A. D., wrote the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. He gives here the duties of a *Bodhisattva*². Stress is laid on the value of love for mankind. The popularity of the work is evident from the number of commentaries available on it. He is also the author of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Sūtrasamuccaya* which are of similar nature but of less value. Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Śṛṅgāraśataka*, is also the author of the *Nītiśataka* and *Vairāgyaśataka*. The former has one hundred verses on moral behaviour and the latter has one hundred verses on the need for the curbing of worldly passions. The critics of the West do not treat Bhartṛhari as the author of all the three *śatakas*. The texts which are now available for these three *śatakas* contain interpolated verses. The *Nītiśataka* is one of the best books on this type of poetry from the point of literary excellence. The *Vairāgyaśataka* is written in a dignified style. Besides stressing on the need to eradicate the

1. Introduction to *Nitidviṣaṣṭika* by M. R. Kavi.

2. A *Bodhisattva* attempts to get realisation (*bodhi*).

evils which are commonly found among the people, it lays emphasis on the worship of Śiva and contains a praise of the ascetics.

To Śaṅkara is attributed the *Mohamudgara* which recommends the giving up of the worldly pleasures and thus getting rid of the errors. This has an ethical and philosophical tone. Some of the other works attributed to the same author are philosophical in substance and have a didactic purpose to serve.

Dāmodaragupta, poet in the Court of King Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (779-813 A. D.), wrote the *Kuṭṭinīmata* which is also called *Sam-bhalīmata*. It contains 927 verses and is incomplete. It can be called a manual for courtesans. It shows how the women could easily beguile the hearts of men. Its popularity is attested by the number of citations from it in the anthologies.

Amitagati, a Jain, wrote in 994 A. D. the *Subhāṣitaratnasandoha* and in 1014 A. D. the *Dharmaparikṣā*. The former has thirty-two chapters on the rules of ethics for both the monks and the lay men. It contains a bitter attack on the Hindu practices and the Hindu Gods. The latter work contains instructions to establish the superiority of Jainism over orthodox Hinduism.

Kṣemendra (1050 A. D.) is the author of a number of works didactic and gnostic in character. The *Cārucaryā* is a collection of one hundred verses on the rules of good behaviour which the author treats admirably by giving illustrations. The *Caturvargasaṅgraha* gives an admirable exposition of the four ends of human existence. The *Sevyasevakopadeśa* has sixty-one stanzas in the form of advice to the masters and servants. The *Samayamātrkā* has eight sections on the wiles of courtesans. The *Kalāvīlāsa*, in ten sections, deals with the various occupations pursued by the people. He brings out vividly the tricks and treacheries practised by certain sections of the people. The *Darpadalāna* shows in seven sections that pride in any form is to be condemned and illustrations are given in the form of tales in this connection.

Hemacandra (1088-1172) is the author of the *Yogaśāstra* which gives an account of the duties of the Jains and the rigid practises peculiar to the ascetic temperament of the Jains. Jalhana (1150 A. D.) is the author of the *Mugdhopadeśa* which gives warnings against the wiles of the courtesans. Silhana (1205 A. D.) is the author of the *Sāntisataka*. His work is cited in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (1205 A. D.) It is in imitation of the *Nītisataka* and *Vairagyaśataka* of Bhartṛhari. The author lays stress on mental peace which he recommends to be practised. Somaprabha wrote the *Sṛṅgāravairāgyataraṅgiṇī* in 1276 A. D. It deals with the disadvantages of the company of women and the advantages of leading a life of detachment.

Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.) wrote the *Subhāṣitanīvi* containing 145 stanzas of wise sayings grouped under twelve heads called *pāddhatis*. It is on the model of Bhartṛhari's *Nītiśataka*. He is the author also of another work *Vairāgyapañcika* containing five stanzas on the spirit of detachment which he practised in the literal sense of the word. Kusumadeva, who is quoted by Vallabhadeva (1500 A. D.), wrote the *Drṣṭāntśataka*. The author, who lived before this date, enumerates the maxims of life and illustrates each of them. Dyādviveda, wrote in 1494 A. D., the *Nitimāñjarī* which illustrates the maxims of life by selecting the stories from the commentary of Śāyana on the *Vedas*, the *Rgveda*, the *Brhaddevatā* and others. He takes in certain cases the Vedic passages and comments on them.

Jagannātha Paṇḍita (1590-1665) is the author of the *Bhāminivilāsa*. It contains four parts, each part dealing respectively with *Anyokti*, *Sṛṅgāra*, *Karuṇā* and *Śānta*. They contain 101, 100, 19 and 32 verses respectively. The verses are all pregnant with sense and are full of vigour. The third part is full of pathos. It is suggested on the evidence of the word *bhāmini* used in this part that the author gave expression to his grief caused by the death of a woman *Bhāminī* by name who was probably his wife. The poem, it is presumed, was named after her. The last part, being an impassioned appeal to the soul, brings out vividly the greatness of the author as an inspired writer.

Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (1650 A. D.) is the author of four poems *Kalividambanī*, *Sabhārañjana śataka*, *Sāntivilāsa* and *Vairāgyaśataka*. The *Kalividambana* is a satire on the happenings in the Kaliyuga. The *Sabhārañjanaśataka* contains instructions to please a gathering of learned men and the royal court, and is full of caustic gnoms. The *Sāntivilāsa*, which has 51 stanzas gives the advantages of maintaining tranquillity of mind. The *Vairāgyaśataka* speaks highly of the benefits of leading a life of detachment. Gumāni is the author of the *Upadeśaśataka* in 100 verses in the form of instructions to the people. The *Subhāṣitakaustubha* of Venkaṭādhvar in (C. 1650 A. D.) is similar in treatment.

Anyāpadeśa is the name given to a type of poems which give the principles of life by making an indirect reference to them through some other object or person. The earliest writer who adopted this type was Bhallata who wrote under Śaṅkaravarman (883-902) of Kashmir. The *Bhāllataśataka*, is simple in style. The verses breathe the spirit of independent thinking and have been cited in the anthologies. Under Harṣa (1089-1101) of Kashmir, Śambhu wrote the *Anyoktimuktālatā* containing 108 verses of *anyāpadeśa* type. The first part of the *Bhāminivilāsa* of Jagannātha Paṇḍita

is also called *Anyāpadeśasataka*. The *Anyāpadeśasataka* of Nīlakaṇṭhaḍīkṣita illustrates the author's imaginative faculties and is one of the best poems of this type. Of similar import is the *Anyoktisataka* of Vireśvara of unknown date.

CHAPTER XVI

ANTHOLOGY

Anthologies are very helpful in fixing the date of the poets and also in identifying their works. They are collections of verses composed by different writers which are arranged according to the subject-matter. These verses are taken from the poems, lyrics and also stray collections. Some of the anthologies mention the authors whose verses they quote. Some of the verses cited in them are not found in the printed editions of the poems. It is only with the aid of these anthologies that some progress is being made in getting at the identity of the writers and their works. They are therefore very useful in establishing the chronological account of the poets and their dates.

The earliest collection of the verses of this type is the *Saptaśatī* familiarly known as the *Gāthāsaptāśatī* which contains seven hundred verses in *Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛta*. The verses dealing with love sentiment and composed by earlier writers are found collected together in this work. Some among them have been identified as the compositions of Pravarasena, Māyurāja, Hāla and others. The author of the collections is said to be Hāla in the text which is ascribed to Sātavāhana by Bāṇa.¹ Sātavāhana or its *Prākṛta* form Śālivāhana was the family name of the Āndhrabhr̥tyas who ruled over Mahārāṣṭra² from 73 B. C. to 218 A. D.³ A king Hāla by name belonging to this dynasty of the Sātavāhanas ruled about 78 B. C. He might have composed the lyrical verses in *Prākṛta* and collected some or arranged for such a collection through a poet in his court and allowed it to pass by his family name Sātavāhana. The Āndhrabhr̥tya kings were patrons of learning and of the *Prākṛta* literature in particular. The date of this work may therefore be fixed in the 1st century A. D. This work, which is called the *Sattasai*, has got realistic and vivid accounts of the various aspects of love. There is tenderness and aesthetic beauty in the verses. The collection, it is held by the critics of the West, underwent several changes after it was composed.

1. अविनाशिनमग्राप्यमकरोत्सातवाहनः ।

विशुद्धजातिभिः कोशं रत्नैरिव सुभाषितैः ॥ Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* Introductory verse 13.

2. The Collected Works of Bhandarkar Vol. III p. 52.

3. Ditto ditto p. 51.

The *Kavīndravacanasaṃuccaya* is the earliest anthology of the *Saṃskṛta* verses. The Nepalese manuscript of this work belongs to the 12th Century A. D. Rājasekhara (900 A. D.) is the last writer cited in the work. The date of the work may therefore be fixed about 1000 A. D. It contains 525 stanzas taken from the works of earlier writers. The author's name is, however, not available.

Someśvara, the son of Vikramāditya II the Cālukyan Emperor, wrote in 1131 A. D., the *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi* which is also called *Mānasollāsa*. It contains much information on a variety of subjects. It has five parts and it deals with kingship, and royal pastimes, which include all topics of interest. 'In connection with these subjects there are few branches of learning or art in Sanskrit the main principles of which are not stated. We have polity, astronomy, astrology, dialectics, rhetoric, poetry, music, painting, architecture, medicine, training of horses, elephants and dogs, &c'¹

Govardhana was a poet in the court of Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (C. 1169 A. D.). Following the model of the *Gāthāsaptāśatī*, he collected seven hundred verses in *Saṃskṛta* and arranged them alphabetically. They deal with love matter and are composed in the *Āryaśmetre*. The work is called *Āryāsaptāśatī*.

Srdharadāsa, the son of Vaṭudāsa, is the author of the *Saduktikarṇāmrta*. He wrote it in the reign of Lakṣmaṇasena. He gives the date of the composition of the work as 1205 A. D. He cites 2368 verses from 446 poets mostly of Bengal. Jalhana, a minister of the Yādava king Kṛṣṇa (1247—1260 A. D.), composed in 1257 A. D. an anthology called *Sūktimuktāvali*. He quotes 2790 verses from the works of 243 poets. In the introductory portion, he gives the contents of this anthology.

Sāyaṇa, who was the minister of Kampana, Saṅgama II, Bukka I and Harihara II, four rulers of the Vijayanagar kingdom, was the commentator on the Vedic texts. He must have lived about 1350 A. D. He is the author of the *Subhāṣitasudhānidhi* being a collection of maxims taken from the works of the famous writers including his brother Bhoganātha whose works are now lost.

Sārṅgadharā, son of Dāmodara, composed in 1363 A. D., the *Sārṅgadharapaddhati* containing 4689 stanzas arranged in 163 sections. The lines are taken from 264 authors including the composer. There is a *Subhāṣitāvali* in manuscript by Sakalakīrti. It is not known whether the author is identical with Sakalakīrti, the Jain scholar who lived about 1450 A. D.

Potayārya wrote the *Prasaṅgaratnāvali* in 1466 A. D. It is a collection of stanzas on miscellaneous topics. Śrīvara, the pupil

1. The Collected Works of Bhandarkar Vol. III, p. 124.

of Jonarāja, wrote the *Subhāṣitāvali* about 1480 A. D. He cites lines from more than 380 poets. About the same period, Vallabhadeva wrote the *Subhāṣitāvali*. His work is divided into 101 sections and has 3527 stanzas from over 350 poets mostly of Northern India. Rūpagosvāmin, (C. 1500 A.D.) the pupil of Kṛṣṇacaitanya, composed the *Padyāvali* in which he cites 386 verses from 125 authors. He has chosen the lines which glorify the worship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Peddibhaṭṭa, composed about 1500 A. D., the *Sūktivāridhi*. Harikavi, who quotes Jagannātha Paṇḍita and must therefore have lived about 1700, wrote the *Subhāṣitahārāvali* citing lines from poets including his contemporaries.

Sambhu, the son of the famous Śivāji, wrote about 1690 A. D., the *Budhabhūṣana*, containing 883 stanzas in three sections. Dr. Bhotlingk, in the latter part of the last century, collected nearly 8000 stanzas held to be the best in the *Saṃskṛta* literature and critically edited them with a prose German translation. The work is called "*Indische Sprüche*." The *Padyāmṛtatarāṅgiṇī* is the work on anthology composed by *Haribhāskara* of uncertain date. The *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra* is the name given to the collection made by K. P. Parab.

CHAPTER XVII

PROSE

Prose is called *gadya*.¹ The *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* and the *Brāhmaṇas* and other portions of the Vedic texts, the supplements of the *Vedas* and the earliest texts in the sciences were written in this form. In the classical period, however, which followed the Vedic period, poetry preceded prose. The epics and the *Purāṇas* were written in metrical form. The verses were found easy to be remembered while prose was not. Therefore, prose was not recognised as a literary form in the earliest period of classical *Kāvya*s. The critics, who were attracted by the metrical form, would not come forward to appreciate prose. So it was harder for a poet to compose prose than verse. An extraordinary talent was needed for a poet to compose it.

Vide :—

गद्यं कवीनां निकषं वदन्ति ।

To satisfy the critics, who expected a high standard in prose, the prose writers had to produce works displaying certain peculiar features. Long compounds with epithets piled upon one another came to be used. The sentences became unduly long in descriptions. Little narration, more description, and absence action came to characterise prose.

The prose compositions are considered to be mainly of two types viz., *Kathā* and *Ākhyāyikā*. A *Kathā* is to be divided into parts called *lambakas*, and have verses in *Āryā* metre. An *Ākhyāyikā* is to be divided into *ucchvāsas*, have verses in *Vaktra* and *Aparavaktra* metres, describe the kidnapping of the maidens, battles and other scenes and contain some marks peculiar to show that the work is by a particular poet. While an *Ākhyāyikā* is to be purely an autobiography, a *Kathā* may have either the author or any body else as the narrator. It is not known when this distinction arose. Dāṇḍin, (700 A. D.) the earliest critic, notices this classification but laughs at this distinction. He holds that a hard and fast line cannot be drawn between a *Kathā* and *Ākhyāyikā* which are two different names for the same kind of composition namely prose. Moreover, this distinction cannot be maintained, because these features of the two types are found more violated than observed by the poets as evidenced in the works available. Still, the literary critics clung to

1. अथादः पदसंज्ञानो गद्यश्च । Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaadarśa* I. 23

this division. It was attempted to make this distinction marked by holding that the *Ākhyāyikā* is based on real facts while the *Kathā* is to have an invented theme. There are *Ākhyāna*, *Farikathā*, *Khaṇḍa-kathā* and other types of prose compositions with slight differences from each other.

That prose came to be used in the classical period even in very early times is shown by the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (150 B. C.) and the inscriptions of Rudradāman 150 A. D.), Hariṣeṇa (345 A. D.) and others. The latter are written in an ornate style which resembles that of Bāṇa and others who lived in the 7th century A. D. Patañjali refers to *Vāsavadattā*, *Sumanottarā* and *Bhaimarathī* as names of prose works, the former two being *Ākhyāyikas*. Vararuci is said to have been the author of the *Cārumatī* a prose. Rāmila and Somila are said to have written a *Sūdra'a'athā*. The *Śātakarṇi-haraṇa*, *Manovatī* and *Taraṅgavatī* were also prose works, some of them might have been in *Prākṛta*, and written under the patronage of the Āndhrabhṛtyas. Bhaṭṭārahāricandra and Ādhyarāja are mentioned by Bāṇa as eminent prose writers. All these works have not come down to us.

Bāṇa is the earliest writer whose works have come down to us. He was the son of Citrabhānu of Śrivatsagotra and Rājadevī. He lived at Prthukūṭa on the banks of the R. Soṇā. He lost his mother while he was a child and his father when he was fourteen. His preceptor was Bharcu. After receiving his education, he wandered throughout the land. His associates during this period were varied and represented all walks of life. He came back to his village rich in wisdom and experience. One day he was invited to the court of King Harṣa-wardhana. Accordingly he went to the court where he was honoured and was made the poet of the court. Having enjoyed royal favour for some years, he returned to his village and lived happily. This is the account which Bāṇa himself gives in his *Harṣacarita*. Nothing however is known about his later-life. Harṣa came to the throne in 606 A. D. Bāṇa must have become a poet in the court of King Harṣa only after this date. The period of his literary activity may be fixed in the first half of the 7th Century A. D.

Bāṇa is the author of two prose works the *Harṣacarita* and the *Kādambari*, a devotional lyric *Caṇḍīśataka* and of the *Mukutātāḍitaka* now lost the exact nature of which is not ascertainable. The critics have attempted to ascribe to his authorship the three plays *Ratnāvalī*, *Priyadarśikā* and *Nāgananda* which are known to have been written by King Harṣa. Bāṇa is an accomplished prose writer and his verses do not rise to the level of his prose in elegance and fancy. His *Caṇḍīśataka* proves this. The verses in the dramas mentioned above are comparatively simple and elegant and do not show any influence from the pen of Bāṇa. Therefore this suggestion,

which ascribes them to Bāṇa on the ground that Bāṇa was liberally rewarded by Harṣa, must be dismissed as baseless. If Bāṇa cared to write the work for getting presents from Harṣa, he might have allowed his *Kādambarī* to pass under Harṣa's authorship and got enormous wealth.

Among the two prose works, the *Harṣacarita* is an earlier composition. It is in eight *ucchvāsas*. In the first two chapters and a part of the third, the poet gives autobiographical account. He traces the ancestry of Harṣa to one Puṣpabhūti in the third chapter. In the remaining chapters, he gives an account of Prabhākaravardhana's life, the birth and growth of Harṣa and his brother Rājyavardhana and his sister Rājyaśrī who was married to Grahavarman, the Maukhari prince. The death of Prabhākaravardhana is followed by the murder of Grahavarman by a Mālava prince. Rājyavardhana attacked the Malva prince and killed him but was treacherously murdered in his camp by a Gauḍa prince. Harṣa marched against the Gauḍa prince but hearing on the way about the disappearance of Rājyaśrī, searched for her and placing her who had donned the robes of a Buddhist nun under the care of a Buddhist monk, resumed his march against the Gauḍa prince. The work ends here abruptly.

The cause for this discontinuance of the work is not known. It is suggested that Bāṇa did not appreciate his patron's spirit of tolerance which was extended to the Buddhists. Or, by the time Bāṇa was writing the work, his patron received a set back in his career from the attack of Pulikeśin II. Bāṇa would not have liked to make any reference to these events. It is also held by some scholars that Bāṇa must have been prevented by death from completing his work. All these are only surmises and therefore have to be dismissed.

The work is valuable for settling the chronology of the poets who preceded Bāṇa. In the introductory verses to this work are mentioned the following poets and works :—The *Vasavadattā* Bhaṭṭārahari-candra, Sātavāhana, Pravarasena, Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, *Brhatkathā*, and *Adhyarāja*.

The *Kādambarī* is a romance treating the love of two pairs Kādambarī and Candrāpīḍa, Mahāśvetā and Puṇḍarīka. This work was left incomplete by the author and was completed by his son Bhūṣaṇa-bāṇa. Due to the effects of a curse, Puṇḍarīka dies and is born as Vaiśampāyana who becomes the companion of Candrāpīḍa. Due to the forces which were beyond their control, Candrāpīḍa and Vaiśampāyana die and are reborn as King Sūdraka and a parrot which retains the name which it had in its previous birth. The two women Kādambarī and Mahāśvetā who were friends and loved Candrāpīḍa and Puṇḍarīka respectively, were assured by a divine voice of their reunion with their lovers. One day the parrot Vaiśampāyana which was brought before King Sūdraka, narrates the entire story of the

previous life which was revealed to it by the sage Jābāli. Through the favour of this sage, the parrot completed the accounts of the previous life and became changed to Puṇḍarīka. King Sūdraka, who heard this, became changed into Candrāpīḍa. The lovers met each other and their marriage was celebrated.

Death must have intervened the completion of the *Kādambarī*. This work must have been written after the *Harṣacarita*, for when the two works are compared in style the *Kādambarī* is more polished and elegant and if the *Kādambarī* had been written earlier, it would have been hard for the author to write another work in a less polished and terse style.

The two prose works are very useful for the understanding of the state of society in the 7th Century A. D. With the rich experience which he gained during his travels, the author had keen power to observe the manners and customs of the people. He did not fail to omit even the minutest item in describing them. Hence his descriptions of the sites both of the forests and the cities, of the palace and of the army camps and of the ascetics and their lives are realistic. He made a deep study into the workings of the human heart. The description of the feelings of Kādambarī at her first meeting with Candrāpīḍa, the death of Prabhākaravarḍhana and its influence on Hārṣavarḍhana, Harṣa's reflections on the death of Grahavarman and others bear ample testimony to this talent of Bāṇa.

As a literary work the *Kādambarī* is superior to the *Harṣacarita*. 'On *Kadambari* in particular, Bāṇa has spent all his wealth of observation, fullness of imagery and keenness of sympathy'. In the *Kādambarī*, which appears to be based on the *Brhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya, the author had free scope to display his talents which he did not have in *Harṣacharita* the theme of which was based on the actual facts of life. The *Kādambarī* is superior even from the points of diction and style. Hence is the justification for the saying

कादम्बरीरसज्ञानामाहरोऽपि न रोचते ।

Bāṇa's style belongs to the *Pāñcālī* type. His name is mentioned along with that of a poetess Śilābhātṭarīkā, whose work is not now available, in connection with *Pāñcālī* as the name of the style which was adopted by these two writers.¹ His style has many brilliant features. The compounds are used frequently. Compounds are recognised as the distinct features of prose.² Bāṇa had to write his works

1. शब्दार्थयोश्चनो गुणको पाञ्चालीरीतिरिच्यते ।

श्रीकाभट्टारिकावाचि बाबोक्तिषु च सा यदि ॥

Jalhana's *Sūktimuktāvalī*.

2. ओजः समासभूयस्त्वनेतद्वदस्य जीवितम् ।

Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaadarśa* I. 80.

in strict conformity to the rules recognised by the critics. The use of obscure expressions with double meaning does mar the effect of the poem. It must however be remembered that while many works suffered badly at the hands of the critics, it is the works of Bāṇa and few others alone which stood successfully the severest test at their hands. Bāṇa has unusually a rich vocabulary. His long sentences are invariably followed by very small sentences. His long compounds used in descriptions disappear in conversations. Thus he maintains a balanced style. He adopts a style suited to sense. He is good in employing not merely the well-known figures like *Upamā*, *Rūpaka*, *Utprekṣā* and others but also the remote ones like the *Virodhābhāsa*, *Ākṣepa*, *Parisaṅkhyā*, *Vakrokti* and others.

Weber criticised Bāṇa's style as 'an Indian wood where progress is impossible through the undergrowth until the traveller cuts out a path for himself, and where even then he is confronted by malicious wild beasts in the shape of unknown words to terrify him.' It is true that Bāṇa's puns on words are twisting and his allusions recondite. His works cause positive terror only to him who has not properly equipped himself for the study of a literary work. The defect therefore lies with the ill-equipped reader and not with the author. Indian writers have fully recognised the merit of Bāṇa's works. Govardhana, Trivikrama, Dhanapāla, Dharmadāsa, Sodḍhala, Someśvara and others have praised his style in appropriate words. The standard reached by him must have been mainly responsible for the disappearance of some prose works written before him.

Bhūṣaṇabāṇa was the illustrious son of his father. He completed the romance *Kādambarī*. Though he does not deserve the unique praise which his father richly deserved, he is not lacking in poetic talents.

Dandin is the next great prose writer. No reliable information is available about him and his life. The word '*Dandin*' appears as a title conferred upon him. His real name is forgotten. It is not definitely known when and where he lived. Many critics have attempted to establish a connection between him and Kālidāsa. The autobiographical version in the *Avantisundarikathā* which was discovered recently tells that he was the great-grandson of Bhāravi the author of the *Kirātārjunīya*. Bhāravi, whose real name was Dāmodara, became the friend of Viṣṇuvardhana, the younger brother of Pulakesin II. While following the prince in his hunting expeditions, he happened to eat flesh to save himself from starvation. Ashamed to return home for having committed this sin, he wandered in the forest and became a friend of Durvinīta an exiled prince of the *Gaṅgā* dynasty. Through the influence of this prince whose dynasty had matrimonial alliance with the Pallavas of Kāñcī, Bhāravi became the poet in the court of King Simhaviṣṇu of Kāñcī. Bhāravi was then about twenty years old. He settled to live at Kāñcī. He had a son

born in due course whose name was Manoratha. Vīradatta was the fourth son of Manoratha. Daṇḍin was born as the son of Vīradatta. While yet a child, he lost his parents. The city of Kāñcī was attacked and plundered by a Cālukyan king. Daṇḍin had to go out of the city to save himself. He wandered far and wide and received good education. After Kāñcī was reconquered by Narasimhavarman I, Daṇḍin returned to Kāñcī and settled there. There he wrote his prose romance *Avantisundarikathā*.

To what extent the events mentioned in this work are reliable, no one can say. From what it contains, it appears that Bhāravi must have gone to Kāñcī about 580 A. D. Durvinita after leading the life of exile became the ruler of his land about the year 580 A.D. Simhaviṣṇu ruled Kāñcī between 575 – 600 A. D. It is learnt that Kāñcī was reconquered by Narasimhavarman I about 655 A. D. It is not unlikely that Bhāravi's great-grandson was born by this date. Daṇḍin might have come back to Kāñcī some years after 655 A. D. He must have, therefore, lived in the latter half of the 7th century A.D. If Daṇḍin of this work were identical with the author of the *Kāvyādarśa*, then this date may be admitted as probable. The benedictory verse in the *Kāvyādarśa* is referred to by Vijayā a poetess and the queen of Candrāditya the eldest son of Pulakesin II. Candrāditya was the governor of a province after 642 A. D. There were contacts between the Pallava kingdom and the Cālūkyā kingdom. It is possible that Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* was made known in the Cālūkyā kingdom soon after it was composed. It must however be stated that the fragmentary and the defective text of the *Avantisundarikathā* does not give any definite hint to fix the date of Daṇḍin.

The *Avantisundarikathā* begins with introductory verses after the manner of the *Harṣacarita*. The names of a number of poets are mentioned. Vālmīki, Vyāsa, Subandhu, Guṇāḍhya, Śūdraka, Bhāsa, Pravarasena, Kālidāsa, Nārāyaṇa, Bāṇa and Mayūra are distinctly mentioned. The passages which contain lacunæ do not help in finding out the names of the other writers of whom something is said in them. After these verses, the work is begun in prose. The city of Kāñcī is described and an autobiographical account of Daṇḍin is then given. Then the story of the *Avantisundarikathā* is begun. It is similar in theme to the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* of the *Daśakumāracarita*. It stops with a description of the separation of Prahāravarman from his sons.

The work is written in a style which closely resembles that of the *Kādambarī*. Daṇḍin might have read the romance of Bāṇa during his stay away from Kāñcī. In descriptions also, he was greatly indebted to Bāṇa.

Besides this work, there is another version of this story in the form of verse. The work is called *Avantisundarikathāsūtra*. It is in seven chapters called *paricchedaś*, the last chapter being in-

complete. The first chapter gives an account of Daṇḍin's life and the next six contain the story as it is found in the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* of the *Daśakumāracarita*. The last verse in each chapter has the word 'ānanda'. This work contains a short summary of the portion of the *Kādambarī* which was written by Bāṇa. The author of the work is not known.

Tradition in India ascribes to Daṇḍin, the authorship of the *Daśakumāracarita* and the *Kāvyādarśa*. The *Daśakumāracarita* is now available in three sections, viz., *Pūrvapīṭhikā*, the text proper and the *Uttarapīṭhikā*. The first section has five *ucchvāsas*, the second has eight and the last has no division. The work deals with the defeat of Rājahamśa, the king of Magadha at the hands of Mānasāra, his exile in the forest where grew his son Rājavāhana, and his nine companions some of whom were princes and some sons of the ministers. The ten princes or companions start to seek their fortunes. They get separated from each other and meet after some years of adventure. They narrate their own experiences during their wanderings. With an united effort, all these attack the foe of Rājahamśa and get back the kingdom of Magadha.

The three sections appear to have been written by different authors at different periods. In point of style, the first and the last sections are decidedly inferior to the middle one. There is utter disagreement between the first and the second sections regarding the details of their contents. It is clear that the first section was written by one who had not grasped the details of the events given in the main text. Besides, there are more than one version of the first and the last sections. From this it is clear that the work lost certain portions both in the beginning and in the end and certain attempts were made to supply the missing portions. It is also suggested that the original work was called *Avantisundarīkathā*. The portion which was not lost came to be called *Daśakumāracarita* probably because its original name was forgotten or found unsuited to the main section which has not much to do with the heroine Avantisundarī. The initial portion which was lost has now been recovered in a fragmentary form.¹ This suggestion however is to remain a mere surmise.

As a prose composition, the *Daśakumāracarita* does not rise to a high level. There are grammatical errors, particularly in the *Pūrvapīṭhikā*. Long compounds which are said to form the very life of prose are practically absent. Vulgarities in sense and expression, which Daṇḍin condemns in the *Kāvyādarśa*, finds room in the work. On this ground, the critics hold that Daṇḍin, the author of the *Kāvyādarśa*, could not have written this prose work. Some others hold

1. Introduction to the *Avantisundarīkathā* and *Avantisundarīkathāsāra*, P. 14

that Daṇḍin was a trained rhetorician but a poor prose writer as proved by the *Daśakumāracarita*. It is also held that the prose work was written as the first work and the *Kāvyādarśa* was written later. These views, in the absence of reliable evidences, are to remain only conjectures.

Daṇḍin is credited with grace in expression (*padalālitya*). The main text of the *Daśakumāracarita* stands to a certain extent as an illustration to this, but the *Avantisundarikathā*, if it be Daṇḍin's, would serve a better illustration. The author, whoever he was, deserves the credit for having composed the seventh chapter in the main text without the use of the labial letters.

Rājasekhara (900 A. D.) states that Daṇḍin wrote three works. The *Kāvyādarśa* and the *Daśakumāracarita* are considered to be two of his works. It was at one time suggested without any effect that the *Chandovicitī* and *Kalāpariccheda* were his other works. Bhoja (1000 A. D.) refers in his *Sṛṅgāraprakāśa*, to a *Dvisandhāna* ascribed to Daṇḍin. It is probable that Daṇḍin wrote one such work which is now lost.

Subandhu is the author of a prose *Vāsavadattā*. It is wrongly argued that Bāṇa refers to this work in the *Harṣacarita*. Bāṇa makes indeed a reference to a work *Vāsavadattā* which was by Subandhu who lived in the pre-Christian era before Patañjali (150 B. C.). Numerous instances are there in the present work which show that its author was greatly influenced by Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*. Vākpati (C. 720 A. D.), who wrote the *Gauḍavaḥo*, mentions the name of Subandhu. Subandhu must have therefore lived about 700 A. D. preferably in the latter half of the 7th century A. D. Two references from this work one to a Buddhist text and the other to the logician Udyotakara are drawn from his work to fix his date. The former reference is vague while the latter may show that Subandhu lived about 700 A. D., the date of Udyotakara being in the 6th century A. D. There is also a tradition which makes Subandhu the nephew of Vararuci. This reference however could not be of any help since Vararuci's identity is not established.

The *Vāsavadattā* deals with the story of a princess *Vāsavadattā* by name. Prince Kandarpaketu gets her vision in his dream and proceeds to meet her. The princess, who has his vision in her dream, falls in love with him. Her maid is sent by her to find out the prince who, on meeting her, proceeds to the city of the princess and elopes with her. Pursued by the army of the bride's father, the lovers enter a forbidden garden where the lady is turned into a stone whereupon the prince attempts to commit suicide. A heavenly voice forbids his act assuring him of his meeting with his lady. He spends the time miserably in the same garden. One day he touches, by chance, the stone from which the lady rose up alive. Then there is happy reunion. The author writes in the *Gauḍī* style. Subtle mythological

allusions and varied vocabulary abound in the work. The author boasts of his skill in composing a work with pun introduced in every syllable.

Dhanapāla wrote about 973 A. D. the work *Tilakamañjari* describing the love of Tilakā a princess and Samaraketu a prince. It is written in complete imitation of the *Kādambarī*. In the introductory verses he refers to Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti, Rājasekhara, Rudra, Mahendra, Kardamarāja and other poets and to *Taraṅgavatī* a prose work which is now lost.

Oḍayadeva who had the title *Vadībhasimha* wrote the *Gadyacintāmaṇi* in eleven *lambakas*. It describes the life of a prince Jivandhara who became an ascetic. The advice given to Jivandhara is modelled on that of Sukanāsa which was given to Candrāpiḍa. He is also the author of the *Kṣatracūḍāmaṇi* which is a *Samskṛta* rendering of the *Jivakacintāmaṇi* in Tamil. His date may be about 1200 A. D.

Agastya (1320 A. D.) the author of the *Bālabhārata* is the author of the *Kṛṣṇacarita*. Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa (1420 A. D.), the author of the *Raghunāthacarita* and *Nalābhyudaya*, is the author of the *Vemabhūpālacarita* also known as the *Viranārāyaṇacarita*. In four chapters, it traces the ancestry of Vemabhupala his patron. He is a mere imitator of Bāṇa and Kālidāsa. He claims a rank, which he does not deserve, with Bāṇa, Subandhu and Kavirāja.

CHAPTER XVIII CAMPU

Apart from the two types of compositions, viz , poems and prose, there is a third type called *Campu*. It is an admixture of prose and verse.¹ Prose and verse are given almost equal proportions. Prose is used for narrations and descriptions. Poetry is resorted to for effective and compact statement. Generally the verses summarise what prose describes at length. This admixture of prose and verse in the *campu* is hailed as the combination of vocal and instrumental music² and of the grapes and honey.³

This type of the *kāvya* must have come into existence before the beginning of the Christian era. The inscriptions of the Gupta age bear evidence to its existence in the 4th century A. D. The books written in this form are called *campus* but some drop the word *campu* in the title.

The earliest *campu* is the *Nalacampu* which is also called the *Damayantīkathā*. It was written by Trivikramabhaṭṭa in a sequel with a poet who challenged Trivikrama's father who was then absent from his place. The work was left incomplete by the poet on his father's arrival. The work, in seven *ucchvāsas*, describes the story of Nala and Damayantī. The last stanza in each chapter has the word '*haracaranaśaroja*'. The advice given to Nala by the minister Sālankāyana is after the model of Sukanāsa's advice to Candrāpīḍa. The author draws illustrative references from the *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika* and other systems of thought. In the introductory verses, the author refers to Vālmiki, Vyāsa, Bāṇa and Guṇāḍhya. The style of the work is rather terse. Trivikramabhaṭṭa is the author also of another *campu* *Madālasācampū*. He is the author of the Nausāri grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III dated 915 A. D. His father was called Nemāditya. His date is to be fixed therefore in the first half of the 10th century A. D.

Haricandra a Jain is the author of the *Jivandharacampū* on the life of the Jain saint Jivandhara. This work is based on the *Uttara-purāṇa* which was completed about 850 A. D. by Guṇabhadra. The author must have therefore lived after 900 A. D. He is a good imitator of Māgha and Vāḥpati. It is not known whether he is identical with the author of the *Dharmaśarmābhyudaya*.

1. गद्यपद्यमयी काव्यचिह्नभूतित्वमिधीयते ।

Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* I. 31.

2. Bhoja's *Campūrāmāyaṇa*—*Bālakāṇḍa*, 3.

3. Veṅkaṭādhvarin's *Visvaguṇādarśa* 4.

Somadeva, pupil of Nemideva, wrote in 959 A. D., the *Yasāstikācampū* in eight *āśvāsas*. He was patronised by Kṛṣṇarājadeva who was no other than the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III. He describes the sacrifice of King Māridatta who prepares to offer to the goddess of the family a pair of all beings including human ones. A young boy and a young girl who are twins, and who are chosen by him to be offered in the sacrifice, recount to him the story of their past birth and also of his. A sage Sudatta gives the king useful advice on the futility of performing the sacrifices. The king becomes a Jain. The last three chapters form a popular handbook on Jainism. There are tales introduced within tales as in the *Kādambarī*. The author mentions in the introductory verses, the names of Bhāravi, Bhavabhūti, Bhartṛhari, Meṇṭha, Guṇādhya, Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Mayūra, Nārāyaṇa, Māgha, Rājasekhara and others.

Bhoja is the author of the *Rāmāyaṇacampū*. The colophons in the printed text refer to the author as Vidarbharāja without mentioning the name of the author. According to the Indian tradition, Bhoja of Dhārā in Malva was the author of the work. Vidarbha and Malva were two different places and the kings of these two places must have been different. From the evidences which are now available, it is not possible to account for the title Vidarbharāja, as applied to Bhoja. On the strength of this tradition, the date of the work falls in the first half of the 11th century A. D. since Bhoja's rule was between 1005 and 1054 A. D. Bhoja wrote the *campū* up to the end of the *Sundara-kāṇḍa* and the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* was written later by one Lakṣmaṇa. The *campū* is written in the *Vaidarbhi* style. It is one of the best *campūs*.

Abhinavakālidāsa (c. 1050 A. D.) is the author of the *Bhāgavatacampū* dealing with the story of the *Bhāgavata* in six chapters. There were a number of poets who held this title. The name of the author is not known. Sodḍhala, a Kṣatriya, is the author of the *Udayasundarikathā*. The author lived in the 11th century A. D. This work is in the form of prose and verse. It may be brought under the *campū* type. In six *ucchvāsas*, it describes the marriage between Udayasundari a princess of the Nāgas and Malayavāhana, a king of Pratiṣṭhāna. It is written in an admirable and attractive style. The first chapter is autobiographical. Someśvaradeva (1240 A. D.), the author of the *Surathotsava*, is the author of the *Kīrtikaumudī* written in the *campū* style. It describes the life of Vastupāla, the minister of Viradhavala. Vāsudevaratha wrote about 1420 A. D. the *Gaṅgāvaṃśānuacrita* in prose and verse describing the history of the *Gaṅgā* dynasty which ruled over Kalinga. Anantabhaṭṭa wrote the *Bhārata-campū* in twelve *stūbakas*. He is quoted by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (C.1602 A.D.) He must have therefore lived about 1500 A.D. Tirumalāmbā, the queen of Acyutarāya (c. 1540 A. D.) of Vijayanagar, wrote the *Varadāmbikā-pariṇayacampū* describing the marriage of her husband with Vara-

dāmbā a princess. The date of the work may be about 1550 A. D. Mitramiśra (c. 1620 A. D.), the author of the *Vīramitrodaya* on law, wrote the *Ānanda¹andacampu* on the early life of Kṛṣṇa. Cidambara (1600 A. D.), the author of the *Rāghavapāṇḍavayādaviya*, wrote the *Bhāgavatacampu* dealing with the story of the *Bhāgavata*. Śeṣa-Kṛṣṇa (c. 1600 A.D.) wrote the *Pārijātaharaṇacampu* in five chapters describing the bringing of the Pārijāta flower from heaven by Kṛṣṇa.

Nilakaṇṭhadīkṣita (1650 A. D.) wrote the *Nilakaṇṭhaviṇayacampu* in five chapters. His wonderful mastery over *vakrokti* and his skill in bringing clearly the subtleties of the sentiments are admirably revealed in this work. This work which describes the feats of Śiva was composed by the author in 1637 A. D. Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita (1600 A. D.) wrote a *Bhāratacampu*. Cakrakavi (1650 A. D.) is the author of the *Dru-padipariṇayacampu*. Veṅkaṭādhvarin (1650 A. D.) is the author of four *caampus* *Viśvagunādarśa*, *Varadābhyudaya*, *Uttaracampu* and *Śrīnivāsacampu*. The *Viśvagunādarśa* gives a picture of both the good and defective sides of life. The drawbacks in the manners and customs of his time, those of the Tamil land in particular, are very well brought out. The priests, musicians, astrologers, physicians and a host of others representing the various walks of life have become the targets of his attack. His mastery over alliteration is revealed in an admirable manner. The *Varadābhyudaya*, which is also called *Hastigiricampu*, is in praise of the greatness and glory of the God at Kāñcī. The *Uttaracampu* deals with the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The *Śrīnivāsacampu* in ten chapters treats with the glory of the deity in Tirumalai near Tirupati. Among these four works, the *Viśvagunādarśa* is well-known in the Tamil land and is very popular. Bāṇeśvara wrote the *Citracampu* which is a quasi-historical *kāvya*. It deals with the life of King Citrasena of Burdwan family who died in 1744 A. D. The work may be assigned to the latter half of the 18th century A. D. Of unknown date is the *Mandāramarandacampu* of Kṛṣṇakavi. This book contains illustrations on metre and poetics.

CHAPTER XIX

POPULAR TALE

Fables are very popular with the Indians from very early times. They are based on adventures, sea-voyages and other occurrences and also on the imagination of those who could invent stories. They are generally connected with supernatural happenings like the movements of beings in the sky and in the mountainous regions, those of the Gandharvas and other semi-divine beings. During the period of the growth of this literature, religious spirit began to exercise its influence in this sphere. The Buddhists and the Jains began to adopt the form of the fables to present their doctrines.

It is not known what the language was which found use originally in writing these tales and what form it assumed. Since these tales were popular in their origin, it is possible to hold that *Prākṛta* was used in the earliest period. In the absence of an early text representing this branch it is not possible to say anything definitely on this matter.

The first work which was written was the *Brhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya. This work is now lost. About Guṇāḍhya and his work, there is some information contained in the *Brhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha* of Budhasvāmin, *Brhatkathāmañjarī* of Kṣemendra and *Kathāsarit-āṣṭhā* of Somadeva, all the three being the abridgements of this work as their authors assert. A tale narrated by Śiva to Pārvatī was overheard by Puṣpadanta, one of the attendants of Śiva. Pārvatī cursed him and also his brother Mālyavān who attempted to intervene on his brother's behalf. Puṣpadanta was to be born a mortal and after narrating the tale to a goblin Kāṇabhūti, would get back to his position. Mālyavān also would become a mortal and after hearing the tale from Kāṇabhūti would get back to his position. Accordingly, Puṣpadanta was born as Vararuci, the grammarian and the minister of the Nandas. After retiring from life, he went to the Vindhya forest, and having told the tale to Kāṇabhūti whom he met there got back to his place. Mālyavān was born as Guṇāḍhya and became the minister to King Sātavāhana who was ruling at Pratiṣṭhāna. The King, who was ignorant of *Saṃskṛta*, felt ashamed to move amidst the women in the harem among whom some were conversant with that language. He called for the scholars in the court with a view to ascertain whether he could learn *Saṃskṛta* without much loss of time and with the least difficulty. Guṇāḍhya, who fixed six years as the period necessary for the king to learn the language, was scorned by Śaravarman another poet in

the court who promised to teach the king in six months. Thereupon Guṇāḍhya swore that he would not use *Saṃskṛta* for literary purposes and left the court. He went to the forest where he met Kāṇabhūti and heard the tale from him. He wrote it in the *Paiśāci* language. The pupils of Guṇāḍhya showed this work to Sātavāhana who refused to see it. At this, Guṇāḍhya consumed it in the forest fire. A seventh portion was saved by his pupils.

This, in brief, is the story of Guṇāḍhya and his writing the work. From the abridgements of this work, it is learnt that the original dealt with the adventures of Naravāhanadatta, the son of Udayana of Kauśāmbī. Naravāhanadatta proceeds to the forest to seek his adventures with his friend Gomukha. He marries a Vidyādhara princess Madanamañjukā. Mānasavega, a Vidyadhara steals her away from her husband. Vegavatī, the sister of Mānasavega, helps Naravāhanadatta in his searches for his beloved. He succeeds in getting her back and becomes finally the emperor of the Vidyādharas. Several tales are introduced into this main story.

The work is mentioned by Bāṇa, Daṇḍin, Subandhu, Trivikrama-bhaṭṭa, Dhanañjaya and others. All these poets knew at any rate the contents of this tale. It is not known whether they, at least anyone, had access to the original. Budhasvāmin in the 9th century A. D., Kṣemendra (1037 A. D.) and Somadeva (circa 1080 A. D.), who condensed the original, tell that they were abridging the original work to which they had access. In the colophon to the commentary on the 15th canto of the *Kīrātārjunīya* by Durvinīta, the Gaṅgā prince (c. 600 A. D.), it is said that Durvinīta rendered the *Brhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya into *Saṃskṛta*. From these evidences, it is possible to make out that the original was not freely available from the 6th century onwards and that it was preserved in Kashmir and Nepal and probably in the regions adjacent to the Vindhya hills where Guṇāḍhya wrote the work.

If reliance is to be placed in the version of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* on Guṇāḍhya, then Vararuci must have lived before 320 B. C. when Candragupta Maurya became the king. Sātavāhana, the patron of Guṇāḍhya, is to be identified with the kings of the Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty which ruled from 73 B. C. to 218 A. D. Guṇāḍhya might have therefore lived during this period.

The language *Paiśāci*, which Guṇāḍhya used for writing the *Brhatkatha*, appears to have been one of the dialects spoken by the wild tribes in the Vindhya region. The kingdom of the Āndhrabhṛtyas with Pratiṣṭhāna on the R. Godāvarī as its capital was near the Vindhya ranges. Rājasekhara supports this contention. In his Report on the Linguistic Survey of India, Mr. Grierson holds that the *Paiśāci* dialect was spoken in the North-Western regions of

India. This however does not affect the view that the Vindhya region was the home of the language. That Guṇāḍhya wrote in the *Paiśāci* language is proved by a reference to this in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa*¹ and by an inscription (C. 875) in Cambodia which speaks of Guṇāḍhya's aversion to *Prākṛta*.

The form, in which the original was written, is not ascertainable. The abridgements are in the form of verse. Daṇḍin refers to it as a *Kathā* which may suggest its prose form. Or *Kathā* may simply mean a story.

The *Bṛhatkathā*, which appears from the abridgements to have been based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, on the stories of Udayana and Vāsavadattā which were available from very old days and on the tales of sea-voyages and adventures of traders and princes, has exerted a profound influence on later writers. Bāṇa and Subandhu knew the stories of the *Bṛhatkathā*. Somadeva, the author of the *Yaśastilakacampu* and Dhanapāla, the author of the *Tilakamañjarī* and also the author of the *Daśakumāracarita* were greatly influenced by Guṇāḍhya's work.

Budhasvāmin of Nepal wrote the *Ślokaśaṅgraha* also called the *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha*. The title suggests that the original was written in the form of verse. The *Ślokaśaṅgraha* has 28 cantos consisting of 4539 stanzas. This appears to be incomplete and judged from the portion now available, Budhasvāmin must have written about 25000 stanzas. This abridgement differs from those of Kṣemendra and Somadeva. The absence of descriptions and the use of the *Prākṛta* forms suggest that this version may be nearer the original. Except for the manuscript of this work got from Nepal, there is nothing to ascribe its place of origin to Nepal. The critics hold that this version must have been produced about the eighth or ninth century on the old condition of its manuscript.

Kṣemendra wrote in 1037 A. D. the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* a summary of the *Bṛhatkathā* in nineteen chapters containing 7500 stanzas. The variation of this work from the *Ślokaśaṅgraha* in its contents suggests the inclusion into the body of the work of some stories which were current in Kashmir. For instance, the story of Vikrama and the vampire is found included here. From the incomplete text of the *Ślokaśaṅgraha*, it is not possible to show that this story was Kashmirian in origin. The attempt of Kṣemendra to condense a lengthy story in 7500 stanzas has resulted in his work becoming unintelligible. The adventures of Naravāhanadatta, the chief character in the original, have secondary importance in the work of Kṣemendra.

1. Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa* I. 38,

Somadeva, son of Rāma of Kashmir, wrote between 1063 and 1081 the *Kathāsaritsāgara* which is really the *Bṛhatkathāsaritsāgara*. It is divided into eighteen *lambakas* and subdivided into 124 *tarāṅgas*. It contains 22000 verses. As in the work of Kṣemendra, here too, there are the stories of Kashmir. As an abridgement, Somadeva's, work is superior to that of Kṣemendra in taste and sensibility. His style is attractive and simple.

The *Avadānaśataka* is a collection of one hundred tales on heroic deeds. These are of Buddhistic origin and each '*avadāna*' refers to the story of the past and draws a moral out of it. They are intended to prove that the life of a person is shaped by the nature of his deeds in the previous births. The author of this collection is not known. These stories must be pretty old. This work was translated into Chinese in the middle of the 3rd century A. D. The collection of these tales might have been made about the 1st century A. D. The *Divyāvadāna* is a later collection made on this model. One of the tales from this work was translated into Chinese in 265 A. D. This collection might have been made soon after the *Avadānaśataka*. Both these are in *Saṃskṛta* prose with some verses included in *Saṃskṛta* and *Prākṛta*. The tales in the former show an arrangement in the plan while in the latter are disorderly. Kṣemendra (1050 A. D.) wrote the *Avadānakalpalatā* also called *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* which contains 107 tales taken from the *Avadānaśataka* and other allied texts.

The *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra is a collection of the *Jātakas* which contain the stories describing the life of a *Bodhisattva* in one of his previous births. These stories are in the form of fables, anecdotes and tales in prose interspersed with verses. It is said that the number of tales is about five hundred. Some of these stories are non-Buddhistic in origin. Āryaśūra was perhaps the compiler of these tales. The date of the compilation cannot be ascertained but it must have been before 400 A. D., for it was translated into Chinese in 434 A. D.

The *Sūtrālaṅkāra* or *Kalpanāmaṇḍitaka* written in prose and verse is a collection of the *Jātakas* and the *avadānas*. The original is available in a fragmentary form. Aśvaghoṣa was considered the author of this work but recently it has been found that the author was Kumāralāta, who came later than Aśvaghoṣa.

The *Vetālapañcarīmsatikā* is a collection of twenty-five tales describing how King Vikramāditya tried to get hold of a vampire which narrated to him these tales. These tales were of early origin. They are found introduced in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* and *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Apart from these two versions, there are available a version in prose and verse by Śivadāsa in the 12th century A. D., a prose version of Jambhāladatta, an abbreviated version of one Vallabhadeva

and an anonymous version in prose. The popularity of this work is proved by its translations into many Indian languages.

Connected with Vikramāditya are many fables like the *Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā*. The *Simhāsanadvātrimśikā* is a collection of thirty-two stories which were narrated by the images sculptured in each one of the thirty-two steps of the throne of Vikramāditya. These were narrated to King Bhoja who having found the throne attempted to ascend it. The images obstructed him from occupying the throne for thirty-two days, each image recounting the feats of Vikramāditya one on each day. The date and author of the work are not known. The work is also called *Dvātrimśatputtalikā*, and *Vikramārkacarita*. There is a Jain version in prose of this work by one Kṣemaṅkara who lived in the 14th century A. D. There is a version in Bengal which is attributed to Vararuci. In South India, it is known as *Vikramārkacarita*. This work also is available in the Indian languages. Other works which narrate the adventures of Vikramāditya are the *Vīracarita* by Ananta, the *Vikramodaya* of unknown authorship, the *Pañcadaṇḍacchatraprabandha* of Jain origin, the *Sālivāhana'athā* of Śivadāsa, the author of the *Vetālapañcaviṃśatika* and others.

The *Sukasaptati* of unknown date and authorship is a collection of seventy tales which a parrot narrates for seventy nights to its mistress who, taking advantage of her husband's absence in the house, attempted to prove faithless to him. The parrot went on narrating the tales every day throughout the night and saved its mistress from betraying her husband. It is in prose. A Persian version of this work was made in the 14th century A. D. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.) was aware of its existence. The work must have been composed before 1000 A. D.

Ballālasena wrote in the 16th century the *Bhojaprabandha* mostly in verse with little prose. This work gives an account of the activities in the court of King Bhoja; a poet and a patron of poets. The literary sessions held in the court were presided over by Bhoja and the participants in them were Kālidāsa, Daṇḍin, Bāṇa, Māgha, Bhavabhūti and others. The accounts given about these sessions are full of wit and humour. The work contains an account of Bhoja's succession to the throne after Muñja. The book abounds in chronological irregularities.

Śivadāsa, the author of the *Vetālapañcatīṣmatikā*, wrote the *Kathārnava* which contains thirty-five tales of popular origin. Śrīvīrakavi wrote in 1451 A. D., the *Kathākautuka* in fifteen chapters in verse. It is based on the story of Yusuf and Zuleika. He is identified with Śrivarā, pupil of Jonarāja. The *Mādhavānalakathā* by Ānanda of unknown date, the *Puruṣaparikṣā* by Vidyāpati and other works are of popular origin.

CHAPTER XX

DIDACTIC FABLES

The didactic fable formed a special feature of the Indian literature from very early times. It is possible to find a reference to the existence of this type of literature in the pre-Christian era.¹ The didactic fable is written in prose with verses quoted. The verses are freely drawn from lawbooks and the epics. They express morals in support of which the stories are given in prose. Generally within the framework of a fable a number of stories is introduced one being linked to the other through the didactic verses. A story invariably has its moral set at its end in a verse which makes a reference to another story which is accordingly narrated. This is the case with every story. This method of boxing tales within tales became very popular and was borrowed from India by the foreigners who produced the Arabian Nights. *Saṁskṛta* was the language used for the purpose.

One special feature of these tales is the attribution of human tendencies to the animals and birds. The animals, birds and plants with whom man has to live have much to teach him by their behaviour. The dark and the bright sides of life are well illustrated with the help of tales which are connected with the world of animals, birds and plants. This practice receives support from the theory of transmigration. A reference to this kind of practice is to be found in the *Mahābhārata* in which Vidura asks Dhṛtarāṣṭra not to kill and persecute the Pāṇḍavas lest he should kill the bird that gave gold. The *Jātakas* of the Buddhists show similar features. The origin of this kind of literature must be traced to the pre-Christian era.

These fables deal with man's activities in the political sphere and in everyday life. The texts which are now available show that these fables were narrated to the members of the ruling class who were to be trained in conducting themselves as the hour and occasion demands. This being the ulterior motive, these fables expose the dark side of life namely, the hypocrisy and avarice of the Brahmins, the cunning intrigues in the harems and the faithlessness of the women and also the bright side of life namely, the greatness and piety of the Brahmins, the importance attached to the discharge of their duties by the members of the ruling class and the fidelity of the house-wives. The vices are exposed with abundant irony.

1. Patañjali explains the formation of words like *ajākrpāṇīya*, *kākatālīya* and others which suggest the connection of these words with some fables.

In respect of form, there does not appear any strict line of demarcation between a popular tale and a didactic fable. Still it is clear that importance is given to the story in the popular tale and to didactic matter in the didactic fable.

The chief representative texts representing the fable are the *Pancatantra* and the *Hitopadeśa*. The former has many versions each differing in slight respects. It does not however seem that all these arose independent of each other. They all go back to an original text which is now lost. A vague picture of the nature of this text could be gathered from certain evidences. A certain text of this fable which was written in *Sanskṛta* was translated into Pahlavi for the Persian King Nushirvan by his physician Burzoe. In 570 A. D., a Syrian version was made from this Pahlavi version by one Bud and an Arabic version about 750 A. D. On the Arabic version were based the versions in many other European languages *e. g.*, the Hebrew version in 1100 A. D., the Latin about 1270 A. D.; the German in 1480 A. D., the Italian in 1552 A. D., the French in 1673 A. D., the Greek in 1080 A. D., the Persian in the 12th Century A. D., and later in other languages. The original which was in *Sanskṛta* was lost together with the Pahlavi version. From this, it is possible to say that the original must have been composed many years before the Pahlavi version which was rendered into the Syrian language in 570 A. D. The date of the composition of the original work may be fixed in the 3rd century A. D., when a need for a work of this type must have been felt by the members of the ruling class who were trying to overthrow the foreign yoke and revive a Hindu Empire. The critics of the West try to connect it with Kashmir, or Magadha. The author was a Vaiṣṇava according to Dr. Keith. In the absence of a definite evidence, all these views remain only as conjectures. Since Buddhism has much in common with Hinduism, no importance could be attached to the suggestion that the original must have been influenced by the Buddhist *Jātakas*. The name of the original text also cannot be ascertained. The titles *Kalilag* and *Damnag* in the Pahlavi version and *Kalilah* and *Damnah* in the Arabian version suggest the title *Karkaṭaka* and *Damanaka* for the original. Whether this could have been the title is open to doubt, for the characters *Karkaṭaka* and *Damanaka* are found introduced in the first section of the *Pancatantra* and not in the other sections. It cannot be verified whether the Pahlavi version was made only for this section. Hence the title of the original cannot be ascertained. The word *tantra*, which forms part of the titles of the later Indian versions of the original, could not have been coined without any bearing of it to the original. The original also might have been called the *Pañcatantra*. Divergence in the order of the sections, and of the fables which is found in the later versions

renders difficult the ascertaining of the extent of the contents of the original. The Syrian version has ten sections while the Arabian has twenty-two.

The nature of the contents of the original can be ascertained from its three chief versions the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, *Pañcatantra* of North India and *Pancatantra* as known from the *Brhatkathāmanjari* and *Kathāsaritsāgara*. The word *tantra* used in the titles of the versions might have denoted a book, a work on conduct or a trick. The *kāvya* style was employed for writing the work in which prose and poetry forms were included.

The title *Pancatantra* as applied to the later versions refers to the five sections included in the book viz., *Mitrabheda*, *Mitrālābha*, *Vigraha*, *Labdhapraṇāśa* and *Aparakṣitakāraka*. The first section deals with the policy of divide and rule which is illustrated by the estrangement brought between a lion and a bull by two jackals. The second illustrates the value of friendship and mutual alliance. The third deals with war, its causes and the possibilities of peace. The fourth illustrates how one loses what he has owing to carelessness. The last shows how inconsiderate action brings ruin. The later versions keep the sections in common but differ in the choice of the stories which are given in illustration of the aims and purposes of these sections.

Two distinct versions of the original are now available viz., the *Tantrākhyāyikā* and *Pancatantra*. The former resembles closely to the Syrian version and is nearer to the original. The style is simple and elegant. Probably, it is only a revised form of the original. The word *ākhyāyikā* tells that it might have been an attempt to present the original in the form of a narrative. This text is of Kashmir origin. The *Pancatantra* is available in many recensions. The *Brhatkathā* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* have their own versions of the *Pancatantra*. A Jain version of the *Pancatantra* was made about 1100 A. D. It quotes Māgha (700 A. D.) and Rudrabhaṭṭa (c. 900 A. D.) The stories are altered and new stories have been added. Pūrṇabhadra a Jain brought out in 1199 A. D. a version of the *Pancatantra*. It is based on the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, on the Jain *Pancatantra* and on some other sources. The Gujarati and the Prākṛta expressions have found room in this text. This edition is called as *Pancākhyānaka*. Meghavijaya, a Jain writer (1660 A. D.); wrote the *Pancākhyānoddhāra* which contains a number of interesting fables. The *Pancatantra* is available in a number of recensions in South India. Kālidāsa and Bhāravi are quoted. This work might have been composed after 600 A. D. A Nepalese manuscript of the *Pancatantra* has only verses with a solitary prose passage. It is known by the name *Pancatantra* in South India and by the name *Pancākhyānaka* in North India. The *Pancatantra* has greatly influenced in the writing of the *Sukasaptati* and *Vetālapancavimsatikā*.

The *Hitopadeśa* represents another attempt to reconstruct the lost *Pañcatantra* by introducing new matter. Most of the tales from the *Pancatantra* reappear here. Verses from the *Nītisāra* of Kāmandaki are included. It has only four sections under the names, Mitrālabha, Suhrdbheda, Vighraha and Sandhi. The fourth section of the *Pancatantra* is completely left out. The author of the *Hitopadeśa* created the fourth section for his work. The author of this work was Nārāyaṇa who was patronised by a certain Dhavalacandra of Bengal. The earliest manuscript of the work is dated 1373 A. D. The work must have been written before this date. The purpose, as stated in the work, was to teach the sons of Sudarśana, King of Pāṭalīputra. The style of the work is very simple and attractive. It is very popular in the Indian vernaculars.

The *Pancatantra* and *Hitopadeśa* come under the Science of Political Ethics. In addition to these there must have been in existence works of similar type. Some of them might have been lost and some got partially included into the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*.

The Buddhists and the Jains have their own texts of didactics. Siddharṣi, a Jain, wrote in 906 A. D., the *Upamitibhāvaprapaṇcākathā* 'in which the manifoldness of existence is presented in parable'. Written in prose with verse, it contains a number of tales inserted within it. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.) wrote the *Parīṣiṣṭaparvan* as a supplement to his *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacarita*. This work has a number of popular tales which the author introduced into his biographical narratives about the Jain saints.

CHAPTER XXI

THE SAMSKR̥TA DRAMA - ORIGIN, CHARACTERISTICS AND TYPES.

ORIGIN.

Indian tradition attributes divine origin to the *Samskr̥ta* drama. At the request of the gods who desired to have some thing which could delight both the ears and the eyes of all the created beings, the creator composed the *Nāṭyaveda* taking the element of recitation from the *R̥gveda*, song from the *Sāmaveda*, gestures from the *Yajurveda* and sentiment from the *Atharvaveda*. Śiva and Pārvati contributed to the part of dance, the former giving his *tāṇḍava* and the latter her *lāsya*. Viṣṇu brought forth the four dramatic styles. Sage Bharata was authorised to transfer it to the world and make it popular which he did accordingly. This *Nāṭyaveda* came to be called the fifth *veda*.

Apart from this tradition which claims a divine origin for the drama, it is possible to trace a religious and secular origin for the drama. From the very early days, singing, dancing and the drama were inter-related. The element of singing may be traced to the *Sāmaveda*. Dancing and gestures are to be traced to the performance of the sacred rites which were particularly connected with the *Yajurveda*. The element of dialogues was taken from those contained in the Vedic texts such as the dialogues between Yama and Yamī, Purūravas and Urvaśī and others. The Vedic rituals contained all the materials necessary for the development of the drama. Still, they could not have by themselves influenced the growth of the drama. The epics and the short narratives provided with the lyrical element which dominates the *Samskr̥ta* dramas. The epics, which were recited during sacrificial sessions, gave the dramas the element of recitation. The influence of the epics is seen in the choice of the themes for the dramas. The influence of the rituals is well noted in the choice of occasions like a religious festival or the worship of a deity when the dramas were staged. Moreover, the dramatic gesture, could not have been invented, for it is in imitation of the events which occur daily. There is the classification of the characters as male and female. There is also a difference in the language used by the characters. All these prove that the drama had its origin in an atmosphere which was both

religious and secular¹. It had its beginnings in the post Vedic period when the epics came to be written.

It is not however possible to ascertain the period when an actual work of the dramatic type was written. The prevalence of drama writing in the early periods is however proved by certain evidences. The words *nāṭa*, *Kuṣīlava* and others which have a bearing on the dramatic art are found used in the early grammatical treatises like the *Aṣṭādhyayi* of Pāṇini (C 800 B. C.). Patañjali, while illustrating the use of verbs to denote incidents in the present time, refers to three modes of showing their occurrence. One and the same incident was shown to have taken place by action, painting and recitation. In illustration of an incident taking place in the present time, he mentions the killing of Kāṁsa and the binding of Bali. This reference shows that in the days of Patañjali 150 B. C., dramatic representations were in vogue. In the *Harivamśa*, there is a reference to a dramatic representation of the story of the *Rāmāyana* in which Kṛṣṇa's son played the role of Rāma. The same work tells that Nārada imitated, in the presence of Indra, the gestures of Kṛṣṇa, Balarāma, Arjuna, Satyabhāmā and others. The Buddhists had a taste for dramatic art which proves that the *Saṁskṛta* drama did not have purely a religious origin. The *Avadānaśatakas* contain references to the dramatic art. The Sitabenga cave near Chota Nagpur contains signs of theatrical representations which prove that before 300 B. C., 'poetry was recited, love-songs were sung and theatrical performances were shown' in those places. The dramas therefore could have risen in the epic period. The dramatic works of this period are not however available.

Some critics of the West have attempted to prove a Greek origin for the *Saṁskṛta* drama. They hold that the Greek dramas were staged after Alexander's invasion in the Indian courts. Striking coincidences which exist between the *Saṁskṛta* drama and the Greek drama prove this. Both the dramas are divided into acts which are normally five in number. At the end of each act, the actors depart from the stage. The entry of a new character into the stage is announced by a character who is already on the stage. The love theme is common to both. The division of the characters as high, middle and low is found in both. The word *yavanikā* used in the *Saṁskṛta* drama to mean the curtain shows its connection with the word *Yavana*. The *Yavana* maidens were employed by the Indian kings as their bodyguards.

These evidences do not however prove a Greek origin for the *Saṁskṛta* drama. The technical part of the dramas in India and

1. It is possible to find a reference to this nature of the origin of the drama in Kalidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* I 4.

Greece might have had arisen independent of each other's influence. Its details should have risen out of necessity peculiar to the occasion. The theme also must be purely of independent origin. The division of the characters is based on actual in life. The word *yavanikā* refers to the Persian tapestry, the material out of which the curtain was made. There are also strong grounds to reject the suggestion of this Greek origin for the *Saṃskṛta* drama. The three unities of time, place and action which characterise the Greek drama are not at all observed in the *Saṃskṛta* drama. It may be said that the *Saṃskṛta* drama does not know them all. Tragedy, which is Greek in origin, is unknown in the *Saṃskṛta* drama. Therefore it must be admitted that the *Saṃskṛta* drama arose and developed independently in India and that it might have been influenced by the Greeks or by some other foreigners.

It is also suggested that in India the drama arose from puppet show on the strength of the word *Sūtradhāra* meaning the stage manager. This word was interpreted as the holder of the threads (*sūtra*) and who pulls the threads connecting the puppets. The puppet-play is only in imitation of the dramatic art which is based on human instincts and actions. The word *Sūtradhāra* refers to the stage manager who holds the threads of the plot. 'The drama as comedy is a national expression of man's primitive life of pleasure and appreciation of humour and wit and it cannot therefore wait to be evolved from the puppet or shadow-shows'.

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES

The dramatic representation consists in the imitation of a condition or state of life or the way of the world¹. The purpose of such representations is set forth by Bharata in the following lines.

उत्तमाधममध्यानां नराणां कर्मसंश्रयम् ।
 हितोपदेशजननं धृतिक्लीडासुखादिकृत् ॥
 दुःखातीनां समर्थानां शोकातीनां तपस्विनाम् ।
 विश्रान्तिजननं काले नाट्यमेतन्मया कृतम् ॥²

The dramatic representation is intended to provide people with cheerful pastime and pleasures and others. It is to give wholesome advice to the wavering and the unruly. It must afford a diversion to those who are afflicted with misery and grief, those who are competent to do their work but require rest, and to those who are helpless on all those occasions when they need a diversion. These being the ulterior motives, the dramas had to deal with all those events

1. अवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्यम् ।

2. *Nāṭyaśāstra* Chapter I. 114-115,

and affairs which could serve the intended purpose. The dramatist therefore had to reproduce the events of the lives of men in a manner intelligible and believable and also capable of creating delight for the spectators.

To achieve this purpose, the dramatist had to reproduce the states or conditions in the life of persons in a realistic manner. The grim realities of existence were not therefore recorded or reproduced as they were, since they could create no impression on the minds of the spectators. Hence a graceful touch was felt necessary to be given to these realities. The *Saṃskṛta* drama cannot therefore be condemned as thoroughly idealistic.

There is no room for tragedy in the *Saṃskṛta* drama which has entertainment for its purpose. The already distressed soul of a person requires some diversion and tragedy will only add to the mental gloom of the spectator. Moreover, the principle of the Hindu ethics namely virtue must triumph over vice does not permit a hero, noble in his qualities, fall down and meet with disaster nor does it permit a man wicked in his nature meet with his fall. The worst effects, which fall to the lot of a man according to the law of retribution, do not arouse any sympathy, for that man is only reaping what he has sown. Therefore his fall is not a tragedy. However, the dramas abound in scenes nearly tragic and pathetic. The *Uttararāmacarita*, *Veṇīsamhāra*, *Nāgānanda* and others have such scenes. Similar scenes, which are available in the epics and in the episodes which they contain, should have left a lasting impression on the dramatists. These tragic scenes would have made the dramas, in which they are found, complete tragedies had not the authors of the dramas sought to convert such scenes into happy ones by some supernatural device.

It does not however mean that the dramas are divided into groups, as in the Western dramas, like pure comedies and tragedies. The comic, tragic and other elements are freely mixed together. The comic element is provided by the *Vidūṣaka*.

The three unities of time, place and plot are not strictly observed in the *Saṃskṛta* plays. The rule that the duration for the dramatic representation of a play is to be the same as that required for the actual occurrence in life of the various scenes contained in the a play is violated in the *Saṃskṛta* drama. It is also held that at least one night shall elapse between any two acts in a play. This too is not observed. Sometimes the succeeding act is only in continuation of the previous one without any interval of time. The events in the *Śākuntala*, *Vikramorvaśīya*, *Uttararāmacarita* and other plays cover a period of many years. The second act in the *Uttararāmacarita* is separated from the first by a period of twelve years.

The unity of place too is not observed. The themes chosen for the drama, and that belief in the intervention of supernatural beings in the affairs of the mortals have allowed the changes in the places of action without which a realistic picture of those scenes could not be given to the spectators. The scenes in the *Vikramorvaṣiṣya* and *Śākuntala* are laid partly on earth and partly in heaven. The place of action may sometimes change within the same act.

The unity of plot however is given importance in the *Saṁskṛta* drama. Perfection in maintaining this unity is attained only by some writers like Kālidāsa, Sudraka and others.

In the *Saṁskṛta* drama, sentiment is given more importance than anything else. Love or heroism may be the chief sentiment while others may be subordinated to the main sentiment. The dramatist, who aims at the delineation of a sentiment, chooses those factors which are necessary for its development avoiding or giving a subordinate position to those which obstruct its development. Poetry form is better suited as a means to develop the sentiment than prose. Therefore there are a number of lyrical verses introduced in the *Saṁskṛta* drama. The *Śākuntala* has about 192 lyrical verses, *Vikramorvaṣiṣya* 133, *Uttararāmacarita*, 255 *Mṛcchakatika* 380, *Veṇisamhāra* 208 and so on. These verses very often describe the emotions and situations. To heighten the development of the sentiment, the dramatist gives a description of Nature. Prose, which may be conveniently used for dialogues, is not given proper room in the drama. The dialogues are best suited to develop action in the plot. Since action is given secondary importance, prose passages are very few. Still, in the dramas of Kālidāsa, and those of Sūdraka, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, Viśākhadatta and others, the use of these passages is of consequence. As a result of the importance given to sentiment, plot and characters are given secondary treatment, for a departure from the normal and simple treatment of the plot and characters would seriously hamper the development of sentiment. The employment of the four dramatic styles *Kaiśikī*, (graceful) *Sāttvati* (grand) *Ārabhati* (violent) and *Bhārati* (verbal) has only for its purpose the development of sentiment. The figures of speech have also been made use for the same purpose. To some extent, this importance given to sentiment has made the drama more idealistic. The preponderance of verses, the meagre use of prose, the stereotyped plot and characters and others do detract the realistic picture of the play. In spite of these features, the dramas of Kālidāsa, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, Sūdraka, Viśākhadatta and those attributed to Bhāsa do not lack in realism. The result has been that the plays came to be read and not to be enacted.

The plot is based on the story of the epics and *Upākhyānas* or is invented. The *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* have supplied many

poets with matter for their plays. The themes, so chosen by them, have not been materially changed. Certain poets like Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti have introduced slight changes in the original themes. Very few dramatists have invented a theme and with success. Śūdraka is the only author who succeeded in this respect. Generally, the plots in the dramas are based on love topics. A prince who is much-married falls in love with a young woman of unknown family prestige who enters into the service of the queen. In spite of the strict vigilance which the queen keeps over the new entrant lest she should catch the attention of her husband, the prince succeeds in meeting her with the aid of his Vidūṣaka. The news declaring the noble birth of the new lady makes the queen bestow her to the prince. This, in general, is the theme. Of course, there are modified themes. The drama of Śūdraka combines love theme with political theme. The plot-construction is at its best in this drama. The *Nāgānanda* of Harṣa has a slightly different theme. The drama of Viśākhadatta is based on political theme.

Next to the plot the characters come to occupy importance in the plays. The division of the characters into male and female imparts reality to the plays. 'In this connection it is worth noting that Indian producers anticipated the West by some thirteen hundred years in permitting the women to play female parts'¹. The restriction in the use of a particular language by certain characters and of another by certain others shows how intimately the drama was connected in its days with real life. Among the male characters, the hero, his rival, Vidūṣaka, servants and others deserve mention. In the *Saṁskṛta* drama, the rival is not permitted to succeed in his part at the expense of the hero. That the hero should never suffer and that his glory is to be shown at the risk of other characters has led to poor characterisation. The same is the case with the women characters. The heroes are of four types Dhīrodātta, Dhīroddhata, Dhīrasānta and Dhīralalita. As lovers, the heroes are of four types Anukūla, Dakṣiṇa, Dhṛṣṭa and Śaṭha. The hero must be of a particular rank according to the type of the play. The Vidūṣaka is invariably a brahmin. Except in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa and the *Mṛcchakatika* of Śūdraka, the Vidūṣaka is a fool trying to help the cause of the lovers and becoming the object of ridicule at the hands of other characters. Among the women characters, the queen occupies a high place. There is the heroine in most of the plays. Women of some other ranks are permitted to become the heroines in certain types of plays. Generally two or more rivals are introduced in a love play. The dramatist is then given an occasion to portray the

1. C. E. M. Joad : The History of Indian Civilisation P 95.

character of the rival queens by comparison and contrast. Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* illustres best this practise. These women characters talk in *Prākṛta*. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Mālatimādhava*, the lady ascetics Kauṣikī and Kāmaudakī give active help to the lovers. They use *Samśkrta* for their speech. While most of the plays suffer from poor characterisation, the plays of Kālidāsa, Sūdraka and Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa are prominent by the characters maintaining their individuality of character.

A drama begins generally with a benediction to a favourite deity. The utterance of this marks the end of the observance of certain preliminary ceremonies called *pūrvaraṅga* which are performed behind the curtain. The stage manager enters the stage after its utterance. In some plays, he enters the stage and recites the benediction which is technically called *Nāndi*. He talks with his wife or his attendant *maṛiṣa* about the drama, its author and the staging of it. He goes away from the stage with his people. This portion is called *Prastāvanā*, *Āmukha* or *Sthāpanā*. Tragic incidents like death, battles, and the utterance of the curse, sleep, kissing and others are expressly forbidden from being shown on the stage. Such scenes and all others which are difficult to be shown like flying up in the sky and which are not necessary to be shown in an act proper are conveyed to the audience in five ways viz., *Viśkambha*, *Pravesaka*, *Cūlikā*, *Ankavatāra* and *Aṅkāśya*. The first two are in the form of conversation on this matter which is to be conveyed to the audience. The *Viśkambha* is pure (*suddha*) when middle characters speaking *Samśkrta* take part and is mixed (*miśra*) when middle characters speaking *Samśkrta* and low characters speaking *Prākṛta* take part. The *Pravesaka* which is not allowed to occur in the first act is in *Prākṛta*, the low characters taking part in it. The *Cūlikā* connects any two acts through a speech made behind the curtain. The *Ankavatāra* is indicated by the absence of the characters at the beginning of an act thus showing it to be in continuation of the previous one. The *Aṅkāśya* makes a reference to what follows in the succeeding act by the characters of the previous act. There are certain other stage directions like *apavārya*, *ātmaगतam*, *janāntikam* and others which permit the actors on the stage speak to one or two among themselves leaving the other actors and in a manner audible only to the audience. The entry of a new character to the stage is made by the announcement to that effect by a character already present on the stage. To denote the urgency of the entry, sometimes a character enters by a toss of the curtain. Certain devices are also adopted to further the progress of the plot like the writing of love-letters, painting the figures of lovers, dance, a play within a play and so on. Interchange of the male and female roles is also allowed as in the *Mālatimādhava*. Introduction of the supernatural element is recognised to bring about a happy

ending as in the *Śākuntala*, *Vikramorvaṣīya*, *Nāgananda* and others. In some dramas, semi-divine beings play their part. Every drama ends with the *Bharatavākya* which is the benediction uttered by the hero or any eminent character who takes part in the drama.

A drama is divided into acts which are divided into scenes which are not definitely marked. At the end of the act, the actors leave the stage. Normally, the number of acts is five but there are plays whose number varies from one to ten. The *Mahānāṭaka* has fourteen acts. No restriction is based on the number of actors. The *Śākuntala* has thirty, *Veṇisamhāra* thirty-two, *Mṛcchakatika* twenty-nine, *Mudrārākṣasa* twenty-four, *Vikramorvaṣīya* eighteen, *Māla-tīmadhava* thirteen and *Uttararāmacarita* ten.

The critics of the west complain that India had no stage or theatre. This charge is incorrect, for the dramas themselves refer to the play-house, art gallery and so on e. g., *Citrarśālā*, *Sangitśālā*, *Prekṣāgrha* etc. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* gives the dimensions of the stage, green room and the spectator's house. The *Bhāvaprakāśanam* of Sārādātānaya refers to three types of theatres.

The *Samskrta* drama is in imitation of a condition or state of life and not of an action in life. Hence it contains frequent stage directions like gesticulating (*nāṭayitrā*). The actors merely imitate what one will do in actual life. Actions like mounting the chariot, watering the plants or hunting and others are all left to be imagined by the audience. The curtain which remains as the back ground throughout the performance provides for the audience an occasion for conceiving the beauties of Nature. The cultured audience could realise what takes place on the stage. The difficulty of procuring elaborate details on the stage should have given rise to the simple scenic arrangements on the stage. To the cultured audience who expect in the drama a perfect treatment of sentiment, this must have been of little consequence and could not have struck them as defective. The critics did not permit in the drama anything which may disturb the romantic setting of the mind. Undignified spectacles and grim realities of life, if shown on the stage as they are, would only debase the mental attitude but the aim of the drama is the exaltation of the mental attitude. Hence idealism was tolerated in the drama to a limited extent.

TYPES OF THE DRAMA

The rich development of the *Samskrta* drama is attested by the number of types of the plays available. The dramas were called *Dr̥śyakāvya* or *Rūpaka*, the latter form denoting the visible presentation of a real form or activity. *Rūpaka* and *Uparūpaka* are the two broad divisions recognised. The *Rūpaka* is of ten types viz.,

Nāṭaka, *Prakarana*, *Bhāṇa*, *Prahasana*, *Dima*, *Vyāyoga*, *Samavākāra*, *Vīthī*, *Anka* and *Ihāmṛga*. Among these, the *Nāṭaka* is the most popular. Next comes the *Prakarana* and then the *Prahasana*. All the dramas barring a few come under these three types. The other types have few dramas to represent them.

The *Nāṭaka* type is to be based generally on a theme which is already available. The hero is the king. The main sentiment is love as in the *Sākuntala*, heroism as in the *Veṇisamhāra* or pathos as in the *Uttararāmcārīta*. The number of acts varies from five to ten. The *Prakarana* type of the plays has the theme invented by the dramatist. Anyone other than a prince is the hero. Anyone including a courtesan is the heroine. The number of acts is ten. The *Mṛcchakatika* and the *Mālatīmādhava* represent this type. The *Bhāṇa* is an one act play with the life of a rogue for its theme. Heroism or love may be the dominant sentiment. Music, dance and others feature this type of drama which is purely in the form of a monologue. The *Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇabhāṇa* of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa illustrates this type. The *Prahasana* is also an one-act play filled with comic scenes. The comic sentiment dominates. The *Mattavilāsa-prahasana* of Mahendravikraman represents this type. The *Dima* has four acts describing the magic feats of supernatural beings. The plot is well known. Gods, demons, semi-divine beings and serpents take part. The dominant sentiment is any one other than love and comic. The *Tripuravijaya* of Vatsarāja belongs to this type. The *Vyāyoga* is in one act with a traditional plot and a boasting hero. It is to contain battle-scenes which do not rise on account of a woman. The sentiments other than love and comic may dominate. The *Saugandhikāharana* of Viśvānātha illustrates this type. The *Samavākāra* has three acts having a traditional theme describing battles. The main sentiment is to be heroic. Gods and demons take part in it. The *Samudramathana* of Vatsarāja serves as an illustration of this type. The *Vīthī* is an one act play with two or three characters with love as the main sentiment e. g., the *Premābhirāma* of Ravipati. The *Anka* is an one-act play describing lamentations with pathos as its dominant sentiment. The *Unmattarāghava* of Bhāskara represents this type. *Ihāmṛga* has four acts with a god as the hero. Forcible abduction is to be described avoiding actual fighting. The *Rukmīṇīharana* of Vatsarāja belongs to this type.

The *Uparūpakas* are of eighteen types of which the *Nāṭikā* and *Sattaka* are prominent. A *Nāṭikā* resembles a *Nāṭaka* in many respects. It has more women characters. Love is the dominant sentiment. It has only four acts. The *Ratnāvali* belongs to this type. The *Sattaka* is written purely in *Prākṛta* and but for the language does not differ from the *Nāṭikā*. The *Karpūramanjari* of Rājasekhara represents this type.

The definitions of the *Rūpaka* and the *Uparūpaka* types should have been evolved from the nature of the dramatic compositions which were then available. Those types of compositions which were evolved on the strength of a few compositions then available did not attract the attention of the audience and this popular disfavour must have been responsible for the meagre representation of these types.

CHAPTER XXII

THE DRAMAS—PRE-KĀLIDĀSAN AND KĀLIDĀSAN PERIODS.

The standard of perfection attained and maintained by Kālidāsa in his dramas reveals that prior to Kālidāsa, there must have been existent quite a good number of dramatic compositions which might have served as a model for Kālidāsa. The excellent finish of Kālidāsa's dramas totally eclipsed all the plays written before him except those of Bhāsa. Except Saumilla and Kaviputra even the names of writers were completely forgotten.

Bhāsa was a predecessor of Kālidāsa. Kālidāsa refers to his eminence as a dramatist¹. Bhāsa's plays were not available till 1911 when some dramatic compositions were discovered by Mr. Ganapati Sastri in Malabar and were ascribed to the authorship of Bhāsa on the strength of the evidences which could be briefly stated thus:—1. All the thirteen plays which were discovered betrayed certain common features *viz.*, (a) The *Nāndī* is recited after the entry of the stage manager. It contains veiled references to the characters in the play (b) The prologue is styled *Sthapana*, and has no reference to the name of the dramatist or the title of the play and has almost the same expressions in all the plays. (c) The *Bharatavakya* is common to most of the plays. (d) Expressions, which are to be treated as incorrect in the light of Pāṇini's grammar, are found in them. These features establish a common authorship for all the plays. 2. The rhetoricians make a specific reference to Bhāsa and his drama *Svapnavāsavadatta* and cite verses from it. Some of these verses are found in the *Svapnanātaka* one among these plays. Therefore the *Svapnanātaka* must be identical with the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. Some of the verses, which it originally contained and cited by the rhetoricians, should have been lost and therefore are not found in the present text. The verses quoted by the rhetoricians, without reference to the source, are found in the other plays. The play *Daridracārudatta*, which is referred by the rhetoricians without reference to the author, happens to be the name of one among these plays. Therefore all these plays are by the same hand and the author must have been Bhāsa, who is referred to as the author of many plays by the later-day writers

1. Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Prologue.

like Bāṇa,¹ Dandin² and others. These plays must have been available up to the 12th or 13th century A. D., for these are not referred to by writers after this period.

This view of Mr Ganapati Sastri who edited these plays under the heading. The Thirteen Trivandrum Plays found support from a section of the critics of the West and of India. Those who did not approve this view refused to recognise Bhāsa's authorship to these plays on these grounds :—1. The peculiar features, which are shown to exist in these plays, are found to exist in the plays like the *Mattavilāsaprahasana* and others which are the works of writers other than Bhāsa. Such features marked the plays which were produced in a certain part of the country namely South India and on this coincidence of features, all the plays having these features could not be attributed to Bhāsa's authorship. The incorrect expressions which they contain are to be accounted for as to due to ignorance of the scribes. 2. Bhāsa's authorship of a play *Svapnavāsavadatta* cannot be discredited. Bhāsa must have been the author of a number of plays. The names of these plays except that of the *Svapnavāsavadatta* are not handed down. The rhetoricians have not referred to any other play other than this by naming it as Bhāsa's. Since even this *Svapnavāsavadatta* does not contain all the lines cited by the rhetoricians, it cannot be Bhāsa's.

A few critics, who take a moderate view of this question, hold that the plays published in Trivandrum represent the abridgements made from the original works for stage purposes. Kālidāsa's reference to the works of Bhāsa, Saumilla and Kaviputra and his remark to their popularity³ are to be treated not as complimentary but as an attempt made with a view to bring to light the defects in them. After the days of Kālidāsa, Bhāsa's plays should have been losing their popularity. The critics put these plays to a severe test in which the *Svapnavāsavadatta* alone fared well. A reference to this is found in the works of Rājaśekhara. Vākpati and others where the word fire is used in connection with Bhāsa and his works. After this test, except the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, his other plays were allowed to be forgotten. Probably, these were adapted for stage purposes by some actors who flourished under the Pallava King Narasiṃhavarman II (circa 680 700 A. D.) who had the title Rājasimha. The plays now published in Trivandrum represent these stage adaptations, most of which have the word 'Rajasimha' used in the *Bharatavākya* thus suggesting the probable connection between these plays and the court of the Pallava Kings. These plays and some other works produced under the patronage of the Pallavas should have been removed to Malabar when the Pallava Kingdom fell to ruin. It is

1. *Harṣacarita* Introductory verse 15.

2. *Avantisundarīkathā* Introductory verse 11.

3. Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* Act I-2.

therefore justifiable that the plays of Bhāsa were discovered in Malabar as also the *Avantisundarikathā* of Daṇḍin, a poet who flourished under the Pallavas. That the plays disappeared soon after the advent of the Mahomedans is purely conjectural. The plays published in Trivandrum are to be treated as the stage adaptations also because, it appears that some passages which the plays ought to have contained are lost in the present editions. These plays would present a complete picture of the plot had they retained some more passages. Therefore these plays appear as the adaptations made for stage purposes from the originals by Bhāsa. Some of these plays in their original forms, must have been written by Bhāsa but not all of them. Some could have been composed by any other writer of South India. Bhāsa's authorship cannot therefore be admitted to all these thirteen plays.

Since Kālidāsa makes a direct reference to Bhāsa, Bhāsa must have lived before Kālidāsa. He might have lived about 300 B.C.

The thirteen plays attributed to Bhāsa could be divided into four groups as regards their sources. Two plays are based on the *Rāmāyana*, six on the *Mahābhārata*, one on Kṛṣṇa's life and four on the fables.

The plays based on the Rāmāyana :—

The *Pratimānātaka*, in seven acts, pictures the incidents in the life of Rāma beginning with the death of Daśaratha and ending with Rāmā's coronation. Bharata ascertains on arriving at Ayodhyā that his father was no more by seeing a statue (*pratimā*) of his father placed alongside with the statues of kings who were already dead. Hence the play acquires the title. On hearing Sītā's abduction, Bharata sends an army to aid Rāma but by the time the army meets Rāma, Rāma returns to Ayodhyā. The *Abhiṣekanātaka* in six acts depicts the story of Rāma from the death of Vālin up to Rāmā's coronation at Ayodhyā. The author breaks the established convention by showing the death of Vālin on the stage.

The plays based on the Mahābhārata :—

The *Pañcarātra* is in three acts. It belongs to the *samavakara* type. Duryodhana promises to fulfil any desire of his preceptor Droṇa at the end of a sacrifice which the latter undertakes to perform. Droṇa demands the grant of half the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas. Duryodhana gives his assent to this on the condition that the Pāṇḍavas could be found out before five nights from that day. Accordingly, the Kauravas begin to lift the cattle from the city of Virāṭa. The Pāṇḍavas, who were living there in disguise, attack the Kauravas and defeat them. The presence of the Pāṇḍavas is found out and Duryodhana declares his willingness to abide by his word. The

Dūtavakya, which belongs to the *vyāyoga* type has only one act. It deals with Kṛṣṇa's role as a messenger of the Pāṇḍavas. This is the only play which does not contain even a single *Prākṛta* passage. The *Madhyamavyāyoga* of the *vyāyoga* type has one act. While roaming in the forest, Bhīma is attacked by his son Ghaṭotkaca who does not know whom he was attacking. Hidimbā, the wife of Bhīma and mother of Ghaṭotkaca, comes to her son and prevents the fight by revealing to him the identity of his father. Therefore Ghaṭotkaca avows not to kill any brahmin. The *Dūtaghaṭotkaca*, a *vyāyoga* in one act, makes Ghaṭotkaca appear in the battlefield after the death of Abhimanyu and predict the death of the Kauravas at the hands of Arjuna. The *Karṇabhāra*, in one act, describes the winning of Karṇa's armour by Indra in the guise of a brahmin. The martial spirit of Karṇa is well brought out here. The *Urubhaṅga* in one act shows the mace-fight between Bhīma and Duryodhana. Contrary to the dramatic convention, Duryodhana's death is shown on the stage.

The *Bālacarita*, which is in five acts, is based on Kṛṣṇa's birth and his sports. The incidents in Kṛṣṇa's life mentioned here are not found in the *Bhāgavata*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and *Harivaṃśa*. Kṛṣṇa is mentioned as the seventh child of Vasudeva. Rādhā who figures in later works as the consort of Kṛṣṇa is not mentioned. The erotic element which prevails in later works on Kṛṣṇa and his sports is absent. Breaking the established convention, Bhāsa shows on the stage the fight between Aṛiṣṭa a demon and Kṛṣṇa and also the death of Kāṃsa. The third act has a scene showing the *Hallīśa* dance.

The plays based on the fables :—

The *Pratiṇāyaganīharayana* has four acts. It shows the imprisonment of King Udayana by Pradyota of Ujjain who desired to give his daughter Vāsavadattā in marriage to Udayana. Udayana's minister Yaugandharāyana takes a vow to effect the release of his king. Hence the title of the play. The minister succeeds in his attempts and fulfills his vow. Bhāmaha (circa 700 A. D.) severely criticises the plot of this play. In the prologue, the play is referred to as a *Prakarana* but the play has now got only four acts. Bhāsa's intention when he began to write this might have been to treat this play and his other play *Scapnavasavadatta* as forming into one whole.

The *Scapnavasavadatta* is in six acts. Udayana, after his marriage with Vāsavadattā, lost a major part of his territories owing to his disinterestedness by being addicted to the company of his beloved. His minister hit upon a plan to get back the lost territories to his king. One day when the king was out hunting from his camp, the minister spread a false rumour that Vāsavadattā and the minister perished in a wild conflagration which spread to the camp. He took her to Padmāvatī, a Magadha princess whom he desired his king should

marry and thereby get the valuable military aid of the Magadha king to crush the foes. Vāsavadattā stayed under Padmāvatī's care as a lady whose absconding husband Yaugandharāyaṇa her supposed brother was searching. Udayana felt very sad for his beloved's demise and agreed, even against his will, to marry Padmāvatī. After the marriage was over, one day Udayana stayed at noon in the summer house. Vāsavadattā arrived at the same spot to nurse Padmāvatī who was slightly indisposed and who was reported to be resting in the summer house. The king, who by that time fell asleep, had a dream of his former wife and cried aloud by naming her. At this, Vāsavadattā quit the spot lest the king should identify her. In the meanwhile, the territories were regained. The minister and the queen revealed their identity. Thus the play ends happily. This play is the best among Bhāsa's and has been enjoying unique fame. Contrary to convention, this play portrays on the stage the king's sleep.

The *Cārudatta* has four acts. It describes the love of a brahmin Cārudatta for a courtesan Vasantasenā who reciprocates his love. One day she deposits her jewels with him at nightfall for fear of being attacked by robbers. Having stayed with him for some time, she repairs to her abode. Sarvilaka a thief breaks into Cārudatta's house in the night, steals away the courtesan's jewels and gives them in the morning to Vasantasenā as a price to free, from service under her his love Madanikā. The play, which comes to a stop here, is considered by the critics of the pro-Bhāsa theory, as having served the basis for the writing of the *Mṛcchakatika* by Sūdraka.

The *Avimāraṇa* is a play in six acts. It describes the secret love between Kuraṅgī the daughter of King Kuntibhoja and Prince Avimāraṇa who lost his princely dignity owing to the effects of a curse. The prince met the princess stealthily since his identity was not known to any one in the palace of Kuntibhoja. In the end, the identity of the prince was revealed by Sage Nārada and the marriage of the loving pair was celebrated.

Recently a play called *Yajñaphala* was discovered and its authorship is attributed to Bhāsa since it shows the features exhibited by the Thirteen Trivandrum plays. This play has six acts and a seventh act called *Nirvahanāṅka*. It deals with the sacrifice performed by Daśaratha to get a son.

Bhāsa as a dramatist.

Bhāsa's eminence as a dramatist was recognised by Kālidāsa, Bāṇa Daṇḍin and others. In diction and dramatic technic he is decidedly inferior to Kālidāsa. The thirteen plays attributed to his authorship reveal Bhāsa as an eminent dramatist. The imperfections

in diction must be attributed to those who were responsible for handing them down to posterity. Bhāsa could not have been the author of the plays in the form in which they are now available. If he had been the author of these plays in their original forms, then Bhāsa must have been a dramatist of high order. The number of dramas which are now available, the variety of their themes and of their types bear testimony to his place among the *Saṃskṛta* dramatists. He must have written a number of dramas but how many he wrote is not ascertained. The violations he made in the observance of dramatic convention show his attempt at realism. The changes which are made by him in the themes he has chosen *e. g.*, the character of Duryodhana in the *Pancarātra* prove his originality in the treatment of the plot. Exits and entrances however are sometimes abrupt and unnatural. It is sad that no information is available about the plays he wrote and that even the plays attributed to his authorship have not come down in their original form.

From the nature of the themes of those thirteen plays and of the *Nāndī* verses in them, it appears that Bhāsa was a devotee of Viṣṇu. There is a tradition which makes him the author of a treatise on dramaturgy which however is not available.

Saumilla and *Kaviputra* are mentioned by Kālidāsa¹ as writers who had won fame along with Bhāsa. *Rāmila* and *Somila* are the alternate readings for the words *Saumilla* and *Kaviputra* which are used in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Nothing definite is known about the identity of these writers. Rājasekhara refers to a *Sūdrakakathā* which he ascribes to the authorship of *Rāmila* and *Somila*. Even this work is not available. Beyond these references, nothing is known about the predecessors of Kālidāsa.

KĀLIDĀSA

Kālidāsa is the author of three plays named *Mālavikāgnimitra*, *Vikramorvaśīya* and *Śākuntala*. He wrote the plays in the order in which they are given here. From the *Mālavikāgnimitra* it becomes clear that the dramatist was aspiring for fame and competing with Bhāsa and others of established repute. From the second play, it is clear that he has earned a name and that he was placing his play to be judged by the critics. The last play shows that he had won fame but awaiting for the critics' approval of his play.

The *Mālavikāgnimitra* has five acts. The characters are historical personages. *Mālavikā*, sister of Mādhavasena, the prince of Mālwa,

1. Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Prologue.

was to be given in marriage to Agnimitra the king of Vidiśā. Mādhavasena started for Vidiśā with his sister. On the way he was attacked by Yajñasena, his cousin who bore ill-will towards him. When he was taken a prisoner, his party continued on its way. Mālavikā lost her way when the party was attacked by a band of robbers. She came to the care of the frontier guard of Vidiśā and from him she entered into the harem of Dhārīnī, the queen of Agnimitra. King Agnimitra fell in love with Mālavikā whom he saw in a picture painted by an artist. With the aid of his companion Vidūṣāka, he managed to have meetings with Mālavikā whom the suspicious queen guarded from him. Iravatī, the junior queen of Agnimitra spoiled the pleasant talks which the king was holding with Mālavikā by making an abrupt interference in the talks. The lovers were joyous now and distressed then owing to these interruptions. After sometime two members of Mādhavasena's party, who lost their way, arrived at Agnimitra's court. Mālavika's identity was revealed and this helped the king in marrying Mālavikā with the consent of Dhārīnī. Pusyamitra and Agnimitra belonged to the Śuṅga dynasty which began to rule from about 183 B. C. The references to certain political events, like the enmity between Mādhavasena and Yajñasena, are not available anywhere except in this play. The play might have been based on the happenings in Agnimitra's court. It is likely that Kālidāsa was a contemporary of Agnimitra or a poet in his court or must have lived at a time when the memories of the people were fresh with the events contained in this play.

The *Vikramorvśīya* is in five acts. Urvaśī the heavenly nymph, who was carried away by a demon, was rescued by Purūravas, the King of Pratiṣṭhāna. She fell in love with her rescuer who was smitten with love for her. After her return to heaven, she paid a secret visit to her lover. Once while she was playing an important role in a drama staged before gods, she, whose mind was full of thoughts of Pururavas, mentioned the name of her rescuer in lieu of Viṣṇu's name which she was to have uttered. Sage Bharata found her guilty for this lapse and denied her a heavenly abode till her lover looked into the face of a child born to her mortal lover through her. She came down to earth and enjoyed the company of her lover whose freedom, in this indulgence, was not checked by the dutiful queen of Pururavas. One day Urvaśī entered into a forbidden garden in a jealous mood and was converted into a creeper. The king went mad not finding his beloved, roamed about in search of her and one day by chance he touched the very same creeper into which Urvaśī was transformed. She rose up alive. After his return to the palace with her, her son, who was placed by her under the care of a lady for fear of separation from the king, was brought before her. The king looked at the child and Urvaśī found that she was to

return to heaven. The king decided to retire to the forest. Nārada arrived at this stage and conveyed Indra's order permitting Urvāṣī to live with Pururavas during his life's time. This story is found in the Vedic texts and the epics with slight variations.

The North Indian texts of this work contain a number of verses in *Apabrahmṣa* which are included in the fourth act. It is however clear that these were added later, since in Kālidāsa's time, the *Apabrahmṣa* verses could not have come into being. The play is said to belong to the *Troṭaka* type which is a dramatic composition in five, seven, eight, or nine acts dealing with human and divine events and having the presence of the Vidūṣaka in every act. In the light of this definition, the play is not of the *Troṭaka* type since the Vidūṣaka does not make his appearance in every act.

The play has a significant title which refers to Urvāṣī who was won by the valour of Pururavas. The incidents are partly human and partly superhuman. The fourth act which depicts the maddened state of the hero is wholly undramatic but yet is full of delicate beauty that defies transcription. The occasion has provided Kālidāsa with ample scope to display his abilities at Nature description.

The *Śākuntala* is a drama in seven acts based on the love of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā, forming part of the *Mahabhārata* as an episode. Duṣyanta, while out hunting, happens to visit the hermitage of Kaṇva who was then away on his business. He is received by Śakuntalā, the foster-daughter of the sage. The two smitten by love enter into matrimony adopting the Gāndharva type. After a few days' stay there, the king returns to the capital having assured his beloved's admittance into the palace within a few days. He also gives a ring to her. The sage Durvāsas curses Śakuntalā who out of the effects of love fails to receive the sage when he pays a visit to the hermitage. The result of the curse is that Duṣyanta forgets everything connected with his beloved. Sage Kaṇva, on his return to the hermitage, ascertains what took place in his absence and sends Śakuntalā who was then pregrant, to the court of Duṣyanta. The hermit girl is taken aback when the king fails to recognise her and therefore declines her being his wife. The poor woman, who lost on her way the ring given to her by the husband could not produce any evidence to prove her connection with him. She is however taken to the care of the priest. Menakā, the mother of Śakuntalā, making her appearance there takes her daughter to heaven. Days pass on. The ring which was lost into the mouth of a fish in a river where Śakuntalā took her bath, is recovered from a fisherman who, getting the ring from the fish which he caught, attempts to sell it in the market. The sight of the ring when brought to the king arouses his memories of the past. He spends a number of years in a sorrowful mood. Indra invites

King Duṣyanta to lead an army against the demons which the mortal king does admirably with success and in the heavenly abode of the Sage Mārīca, he meets his wife and son and has happy reunion.

This play, which is available in many recensions, has for its title *Abhijnānaśakuntala* since the ring, given as a mark of recognition, was responsible for the events of the latter part of the play. The main sentiment is love but there is from the fourth act an under-current of pathos.

In this and the second play, the dramatist introduced supernatural element to bring about a happy ending. To further the progress of the plot, he used dance in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, a reference to a dramatic performance in the *Vikramorvoṣīya* and a song in the *Śakuntala*.

Kālidāsa as a dramatist, poet and lyric writer.

Kālidāsa chose love themes for all his plays. There is an orderly development in a progressive manner in his plays of his conception of love and characterisation. Agnimitra is a much-married hero who desires to marry Mālavikā whom he would be justified to choose as the bride for his son Vasumitra. His dealings in the affairs of love are connected with two queens and Mālavika, all of them being different by temperament. The dramatist exposed vividly the insatiable sensuality of the hero. The dramatist's attempt to show the three women as rivals resulted in the poor characterisation of Mālavikā and of Agnimitra as a lover although he does ample justice to his kingly qualities. In the second drama, the rivals are reduced to two. The behaviour of the queen is more dignified than in the previous play. Urvāṣī however is lacking in maternal affection. In the *Śakuntala*, no rival is introduced on the stage since it spoils the dignity of the hero and the heroine and this helped much in the characterization of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā.

The women characters receive a better treatment than men characters at the hands of Kālidāsa. This is true also of the women in his poems. All the women are shown to suffer for no fault of their own. Kālidāsa appears to hint that the women suffer due to neglect of duty on the part of their men. They are of various types. Through the women, Kālidāsa ennobles the men characters. The ascendancy of nobility is from the sensual Agnimitra to the valiant Pururavas and from him to the repentent Duṣyanta.

Kālidāsa proclaims that love's goal is not physical passion but goodness. Love becomes ennobled and spiritualised not by indulgence in passions but by suffering and repentance. This truth is well illustrated through the characters of the Yakṣa's wife, Duṣyanta, Śakuntalā, and Pārvatī. While illustrating this, the dramatist has gauged the services of the Vidūṣaka who is found very helpful

in settling the love intrigues of indecent type. The Viduṣaka, who is the mainspring of the actions in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, occupies the position of a fool in the *Vikramonaśiṣya*. In the *Śākuntalā*, he makes appearance probably to respect the dramatic convention. He is not shown to have seen Śākuntalā even once. Kālidāsa is equally good in bringing the characters of secondary nature *e.g.*, the compassionate Kaṇva, and the two companions of Śākuntalā

His style is easy flowing, and elegant. It is elaborate and does not admit of improvement at other's hands. Words are chosen in large numbers from common usage. He succeeds in being concise and suggestive. His style belongs to the *Vaidarbhi* type. His verses are free from long compounds. The dialogues in the dramas are short and simple. He is very good in describing Nature to which he gives life. He has a remarkable power to understand the workings of the human heart on occasions of trials. His treatment of love is admirable. The appropriate selection he has made of the objects for his similes has earned for him a unique reputation expressed in the words उरुमा कालिदासस्य. He is equally good at home at other figures of speech. He aims at the perfect delineation of sentiment which he would not allow to suffer by high flights of imagination or by displaying his skill in remote figures of speech. 'The harmony of the poetic sentiment is nowhere disturbed by anything violent or terrifying. Every passion is softened without being enfeebled. The ardour of love never goes beyond aesthetic bounds ; it never maddens to wild jealousy or hate. The torments of sorrow are toned down to a profound and touching melancholy. It was here at last that the Indian genius found the law of moderation in poetry, which it hardly knew elsewhere, and thus produced works of enduring beauty.'¹ He composed a verse in a Vedic metre². His eminence as a great writer is admitted both by the Indian and Western scholars. Of him, the German poet Goethe writes :—

Would'st thou the young year's blossoms
and the fruits of its decline,

And all by which the soul is charmed,
enraptured, feasted, fed,

Would'st thou the Earth and Heaven itself
in one sole name combine ?

I name thee, O Sakuntala ! and all at
once is said

Among Indian poets, Bāṇa speaks thus :—

-
1. A History of Sanskrit Literature by A.A. Macdonell. P. 353.
 2. Kālidāsa's *Śākuntalā* Act IV 8.

निर्गन्तासु न वा कस्य कालिदासस्य सूक्तिषु ।
प्रीतिर्मधुरसान्द्रासु मञ्जरीष्विव जायते ॥

Harṣacarita; Introductory verse 16.

Dandin writes in his *Arantisundarikathā* :—

लिप्ता मधुद्रवेणासन् यस्य निर्धिवशा गिरः ।
तेनेदं वर्त्म वैदर्भं कालिदासेन शोधितम् ॥

Introductory verse 15.

His name is associated with *Śākuntala* with a high sense of appreciation¹. Of *Śakuntala*, it is said : ' Vivid and beautiful, it achieves elegance without loss of strength and eloquence without sacrifice of precision '.²

His works suggest that he was a firm devotee of Śiva and convinced in the oneness of the gods of the Hindu Trinity³. He was a firm believer in the teachings of the *Upaniṣads* and the *Bhagavadgītā*. He was well-versed in the principles of the *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga* and *Vedānta* systems of thought. Probably he wrote a work called *Kuntēśvaradautya* from which Kṣemendra (1050 A D) quotes but which is lost. He is easily the best among poets, lyric writers and dramatists.

The general charge that is brought on Kālidāsa by the critics of the West is that he did not suggest ways and means to solve the problems of life. That this charge is entirely baseless becomes evident from a study of the works of Kālidāsa. Kālidāsa does not express but suggests. His works contain unlimited sayings which, he expected would serve the purpose of the individuals concerned. He did not write a separate treatise to discuss the problems of life but he availed himself of every occasion to express his views on them. The value of renunciation, the short-comings of addiction to beastly passion, nobility of the divine aspect of love, and the duties of king and others are broadly touched by him.

1. कालिदासस्य सर्वस्वमभिज्ञान शाकुन्तलम् ।

तत्रापि च चतुर्थोऽङ्कः यत्र याति शाकुन्तला ॥

2. C. E. M. Joad. The History of India Civilisation P. 97.

3. Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*. Canto VI—44.

CHAPTER XXIII

POST—KĀLIDĀSAN DRAMATISTS

Sudraka comes next to Kālidāsa as the dramatist who wrote the *Mṛcchakatika* a *Prakarana* in ten acts. His identity is not yet settled. His name occurs in many stories as that of a hero or a character. In the prologue of this play, he is mentioned as a poet and king who made his son the king after him and entered into the fire after having lived for one hundred years and eight more days. This reference to the author by himself has made the critics dismiss as absurd the tradition which makes him the author of the play. There is nothing wrong if Sudraka is to be treated as the author of the play after ignoring this reference as a piece of interpolation.

The date of the author may also be easily fixed. The play contains references to the southerners, Kārṇāṭa, Drāviḍa, Cola, the quarrel of the Kārṇāṭaka and others. From these, it appears that the dramatist must have been either a southerner or one who knew well the southern country. The simplicity of style, the variety of the *Prākṛtas* and other features show that the play must have been composed long before the dates of Harṣa and Bhavabhūti. It is believed that Sudraka was a historical personage who killed Svāti an Āndhrabhṛtya prince¹. The freedom with which a Buddhist character moves about, public disloyalty to the reigning king, overthrow of the ruling prince by political intrigues, recognition of the courtesan as the lawfully wedded wife and the unstable, rather poor, standard of political, social and economic conditions show that the work must have been composed about the beginning of the Christian era.

The discovery of the Trivandrum plays which are attributed to Bhāsa has created problems about the authorship of this play. The *Cārudatta* or *Daridrācārudatta* one of these Trivandrum plays is identical in contents with the first four acts of this play. The supporters of Bhāsa's authorship for the Trivandrum plays seek to show that Sudraka wrote six acts in continuation of Bhāsa's *Cārudatta* and gave the name *Mṛcchakatika* for the drama which was made up by him of the four acts of Bhāsa's play and the six acts which he wrote in continuation of it. He claimed his authorship for the whole drama.

This contention of the advocates of Bhāsa's authorship to the Trivandrum plays is very amusing. The drama *Mṛcchakatika* has a political theme as the sub-plot. The entire credit for having

1. Introduction to the *Arantisundarikatha* and *Arantisundarikathasara* pp. 7, 8.

woven this theme into the love theme in an admirable way goes to Sudraka. Sudraka, who was gifted with originality, could not have ventured to include, within his work what another wrote and claim his authorship for the entire work. Had he done this, his reputation should have suffered. Instead he could have produced a different play altogether. Moreover, Bhāsa's name is not mentioned by any rhetorician in connection with the *Daśarūpaka* which must be only an abridgement of the *Mṛcchakatika*. The earliest writer to quote from the *Mṛcchakatika* and to mention the name of Sudraka was Vāmana (C. 800 A. D.). The authorship of Sudraka to the play *Mṛcchakatika* cannot be therefore disputed.

The contents of the first four acts of the *Mṛcchakatika* are the same as those of the *Cārudatta* which is attributed to Bhasa. The next day Vasantasena spends the night in the house of Cārudatta. He leaves in the next morning for the city park after asking Vasantasenā to meet him here. Rohasena, the young boy of Cārudatta, demands of his nurse a well-equipped toy-cart to play with in lieu of the mud cart which she gives him. Vasantasenā takes pity on the boy, fills the mud cart with her jewels and appeases the child. She starts for the park, by mistake, in a cart which she thinks Cārudatta has arranged for her use. In fact, that cart belonged to Samsthānaka, the brother-in-law of the ruling chief of the land. He was a villain whose love Vasantasenā did not reciprocate. The cart leads her to the garden where Samsthānaka is waiting for her. Upon her refusal to accept his love, she is thrust down to the ground by the villain where she falls down unconscious. Soon after this, the villain files a complaint in the court of law accusing Cārudatta for the murder of Vasantasenā out of a desire to get her jewels. In the meanwhile, Āryaka a political prisoner escapes from the prison and gets refuge in the cart which Cārudatta has arranged for Vasantasenā's use. Cārudatta offers him protection. Āryaka joins Śarvilaka and others to dethrone the reigning king. Disappointed at the non-arrival of his beloved, Cārudatta returns home where he is served with an order to appear in the court and he goes there. While the trial is conducted, Vidūṣaka the friend of Cārudatta who is asked by the latter's wife to return the jewels to the courtesan, hears on the way about the case in which his friend is involved and he at once hastens to the court. Cārudatta, who has no proof to prove his innocence, is found guilty and is ordered to be executed on the evidence of the ornaments of Vasantasenā brought by the Vidūṣaka. When he is taken to the place of execution, Vasantasenā, who on regaining her conscious state is attended by a Buddhist medicant, comes to the very same place followed by the medicant. Due to her presence in that place Cārudatta is set free. Samsthānaka, who is taken a prisoner for having lodged a false complaint, pleads for mercy in the presence of Cārudatta who willingly allows him to go free. In the

The sources of the play are not known. The incident of filling the mudcart by Vasantasenā with her jewels marks the turning point in the events of the play and hence the justification for the title of the play. The scenes describing gambling, theft and the policemen's search for the escaped convict are very realistic. The structure of the plot is the best in this play. The author's intimate knowledge of music, gambling and theft is well brought out. The author broke the rules of dramatic convention by including the scenes of sleep and strangulation to be shown on the stage. The author is skilled in effective characterisation. There are as many as thirty characters representing all walks of life from that of the learned judge to that of executioners. This gives a cosmopolitan outlook for the play. The characters are individuals and not types as in the case of other *Samskr̥ta* plays. Love, humour and pathos are the sentiments of the play among which love has a dominating influence. It is conduct, this play decides, that heightens one's character. The style is very simple and natural but not highly polished like that of *Kālidāsa*. The author shows his skill in the use of varieties of *Prākṛtas*. Six characters use *Samskr̥ta*, fifteen *Śaurasenī* and seven *Māgadhī*. Different dialectal differences are found in these *Prākṛtas*. Out of 377 verses ninety-nine are in *Prākṛta*. The stage manager begins in *Samskr̥ta* but changes into *Prākṛta*. Vasantasenā speaks in *Samskr̥ta* and *Prākṛta*. Effective characterisation, qualities of vigour, life and action, wealth of incidents, absence of elaborate description except in Act V, and the simple and clear diction give the play a realistic touch which is hard to be found in any other play in the *Samskr̥ta* literature.

Śūdraka is also said to be the author of a *Bhāṇa* called *Padmaprābhṛtaka* which portrays the love of Devadattā and Muladeva the authority for the thieves. There is mention of a grammarian Dattakalaśi as a predecessor of Pāṇini. There is also a reference to a *Prakarāṇa Kumudvatiprakarāṇa* and a *Prākṛta* poem *Kāmadatta*. Both of them are of unknown authorship and are not available. Similarity in diction supports its authorship to Śūdraka.

The writer, who came next to Śūdraka, was the Buddhist Aśvaghoṣa who wrote the *Saundarananda* and *Buddhacarita*. He is the author of a *Prakarāṇa* called *Sāriputraprakarāṇa* or *Śaradavatiputraprakarāṇa*. In nine acts, it deals with the conversion of Maudgalyāyana and Sāriputra into Buddhism by Gautama Buddha. The canons of dramaturgy are all strictly followed by the author. Two other plays, probably from the pen of the same dramatist, are found in fragments attached to the manuscript which contains the *Sāriputraprakarāṇa*. Their titles are not known. One of them is allegorical. The other has Magadhavatī a hetæra as one of the characters and has the scene of action placed in a garden.

There are some plays whose dates are not definitely known but could be placed in the first two centuries after the beginning of the Christian era. The *Ubhayābhisārikā*, which describes the lives of Kuberadatta and Narayanadattā, is a *Bhāna* written by Vararuci. The identity of the author is not decided. It contains references to the principles of the *Sāṅkhya* and *Nyāya* systems and of the art of dancing. It betrays the various features which are said to belong to the plays attributed to Bhāsa's authorship.

Isvaradatta is known as the author of a *Bhāna* called *Dhūrtavīṭa-samvāda* which could be described as a handbook on the ways of courtesans. Kusumapura is mentioned. Dattaka is spoken as an authority on the science of love. The absence of reference to the *Kāmasūtra* (circa 250 A. D.) in the play may assign it to the 1st or 2nd century A. D. Nothing is known about the author.

Bodhāyana is said to be the author of a farce (*Prahasana*) called *Bhagavadajjuka*. Nothing is known about the author. The names of the ten types of plays which this drama contains are different from those given in other works. This suggests that the play might have been written about the 1st or 2nd century A. D. This play is mentioned along with the *Mattarilasaprahasana* in an inscription dated 610 A. D. of Mahendravarman the Pallava king. The obscure reading of the inscription renders a decision on the authorship of this play impossible. Certain critics relying on the evidence of this inscription attribute to this play the authorship of Mahendravarman. An ascetic styled as Bhagavān, enters into the dead body of a courtesan Ajjukā by name to display his yogic powers. The dead body gets back life and gives discourses on asceticism. The soul of the courtesan is ordered by the Lord of Death to get back to the world whereupon it gets into the lifeless body which is kept in a safe place by the Bhagavān so that he could get back into it whenever he desires. His body which gets back life begins to discourse upon matters of love. The author's acquaintance with the principles of the systems of philosophy is clearly revealed.

The *Viṇāvāsavadattam* is a play which is incomplete breaking off in the fourth act. It describes how Udayana's imprisonment by Pradyota helped Vāsavadatta to learn from Udayana the art of playing on the lute. The author of the play is not known. From the style of the work, the play is to be placed in the early centuries of the Christian era. Of unknown authorship is the *Dāmaka*, a *Prahasana* describing how Karna studied under Paraśurāma. Dāmaka, a friend of Karna, plays the important role. This play displays the features of the plays attributed to Bhāsa's authorship. The date of the play is to be fixed in the early centuries of the Christian era.

Diṇnāga, who is also styled as Dhīranāga, wrote the play *Kundamālā* in six acts basing its theme on the incidents of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*

of the *Rāmāyana*. The author cannot be identical with the Diñnāga, the Buddhist logician who has nothing to do with the Hindu theme of the play. From the simplicity of style, the author must be taken to have lived about 200 A. D. His influence may be noticed in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabuti (c. 700 A. D.). His simpler style when contrasted from the rigid and rough style of Bhavabhuti proves his earlier date to that of Bhavabhuti. The play betrays the influences of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. It is not known whether he could have been a contemporary of Kālidāsa. The name of the author is given as Dhīranāga in some manuscripts. The play ends happily with Sīta's purity of conduct testified before Rāma by the Mother Earth and with Kuśa and Lava made the king and the crown prince respectively. This is the earliest play to deal with the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the epic. One special feature here is the introduction of the Viduṣaka.

Viśākhadatta was the son of Bhāskaradatta a minister of a prince Prthu. He is the author of a play *Mudrārākṣasa* in seven acts. The *Bharatavākya* refers to a king called Candragupta. Dantivarman, Rantivarman and Avantivarman are the variant readings for the word Candragupta. The word Candragupta may not refer to Candragupta Maurya who is the hero of the play but to Candragupta the Gupta Emperor. In this case, the author's date is to be about 350 A. D. The word Dantivarman may refer to the Rāṣtrakūṭa Dantivarman (circa 600 A. D.) or the Lāṭa king Dantivarman (circa 850 A. D.) or the Pallava King Dantivarman (circa 800 A. D.). The reading Dantivarman appears to be defective. The word Avantivarman suggests the author's connection with the king of this name who belonged to the Maukhari dynasty and who was the father-in-law of Rājyasrī, the sister of Harṣa, King of Sthāṇvīśvara. This places the author near Bengal about 600 A. D. This connection with the Maukhari king and this date appear to be correct as the author was aware of the geographical surroundings of Pāṭalīputra which is described as a prosperous city in the drama. The city was in ruins at the time of Hieun Thsang's visit. The author may therefore be taken to have lived before 600 A. D. and after 500 A. D. The Huns referred to in the play may be the same as those against whom Rājyavardhana launched an attack. The play is based on the attempts made by Rākṣasa a minister of the Nandas to do away with Candragupta whom he did not like to be on the throne for the reason that the Nandas were killed treacherously by some one to provide Candragupta with royal powers. All his attempts were foiled by the clever of a brahmin Cāṇakya who was interested in the welfare of Candragupta under whom he was keen in forcing Rākṣasa to accept ministry. By the clever ruse of the spies, Cāṇakya succeeded in getting the signet of Rākṣasa and forged a letter, which was to be disclosed to the able supporters of Rākṣasa. The letter which was sealed with the

signet of Rākṣasa created disruption between Rākṣasa and his allies. Rākṣasa, who had therefore become helpless, rushed to save a dear friend of his who was to be executed by the order of Candragupta on grounds of treason. Cāṇakya promised pardon to the guilty person on condition that Rākṣasa would be the prime minister of Candragupta. The poor Rākṣasa had no other alternative but to yield. Cāṇakya succeeded in his enterprise by the use of the signet of Rākṣasa and hence the title. The play has traces of the influences from the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. The author is quite at home with the technicalities of astronomy, astrology and logic. This is the only play with a purely political theme. Subtle plot construction and the well-knit scenes give an individual stamp to the play. The style of the play is simple, full of vigour and force and free from long compounds. From the references in the works of the rhetoricians, Viśākhadatta, who is also styled as Viśākhadeva, is known to have written the *Devicandragupta*, a love play concerning Candragupta, and the *Abhisārikāvañcitaka* or *Abhisārikābandhitaka* in which Udayana, Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī play their parts. Both these plays are lost. On the strength of the word Candragupta used in the *Bhāratavākya* of the *Mudrārākṣasa* and on the contents of the *Devicandragupta*, it appears that the author might have lived in the court of the Gupta kings which would give 350 A. D. as the approximate date of the dramatist.

The *Kaumudimahotsava* is a play in five acts describing how King Kalyāṇavarman regained his lost kingdom of Magadha about 340 A. D. The play was staged when Kalyāṇavarman was made the king. The plot is of a political nature with room given to love matters. The author of the play is not known. The word denoting the authors' name is lost partially the ending being 'kayā'. This suggests that the play was written by a woman whose name is not known. There are clear traces of influences from the plays of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. The date of the work may be placed in the 4th century A. D.

Mahendravikraman I, son of Simhaviṣṇu the Pallava king, wrote a *Prahasana* called the *Mattavilāsaprahasana*. The date of the work is about 610 A. D. The farce depicts the city life at Kāñcī. Karpata is mentioned as an author of a manual for thieves. The author shows how the adherents of Buddhism and of the religions of the Kāpālikas and Pāśupatas were degraded in their practises by their drinking habits.

Syāmilaka wrote a *Bhāṇa* called *Pādatāḍitaka*. He mentions Pārasava as the name of a poet. Parasava is referred to by Bāṇa. The play contains references to the Budddists, Ceylonese, Āndhras, Koṅkaṇa, etc. A poet by the name Āryakay is mentioned as having come from the south. *Vaktra* and *Aparavaktra* metres are referred to. The style approaches that of Bāṇa's *Kādambari* Somila, mentioned by Bāṇa as

his friend, might have been identical with this author. Then the date of the author would come to the first half of the 7th century A. D. The reference to Dattaka as an authority on love and the absence of reference to the *Kamasūtra* of Vātsyāyana (C. 250 A.D.), do not favour this date for the author. A brahmin Viṣṇunāga by name, received on his head a kick from the foot of a courtesan. He met a number of men whom he considered as authorities to suggest a means to expiate this defect and they prescribed the kick from the other foot of the courtesan as the remedy. Probably this title suggested to Bāṇa *Mukutaṭāḍitaka* as the name for one of his works.

Harṣavardhana, usually referred to as Harṣadeva, was the King of Sthāṇvīśvara between 606 and 648 A. D. He was himself a poet and a patron of poets prominent among whom were Bāṇa, Mayura, Mātāṅgadvākara and others. He is known as the author of three plays, *Ratnāvali*, *Priyadarśikā* and *Nāgānanda*. The critics of the West doubt his authorship to these plays and ascribe it to Bāṇa or any other poet in the court of Harṣa. It is clear from the language of the plays that Bāṇa could not have been the author. The traditional view making Harṣa their author cannot be brushed aside since it is supported by Hieun Thsang's reference to Harṣa as the author of a play on the joy of snakes.

The *Ratnāvali* is a *Nāṭika* in four acts describing how Udayana of Kauśāmbī married Sāgarikā, the princess of Ceylon. The entire plot is modelled on that of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Sāgarikā, who is imprisoned by Vāsavadattā for the former's intimacy with Udayana, is released by Udayana with the aid of a magician. Happy union, between the lovers, is had by a message from the Ceylonese King referring to Sāgarikā as his daughter. The vision conjured by the magician and the exchange of costumes by Sāgarikā who wore the garb of the queen to escape detection at her hands are invented by the dramatist.

The *Priyadarśikā* is another *Nāṭikā* in four acts concerning the love of Udayana and a princess Aranyikā. The plot is the same as in the *Ratnāvali* and *Mālavikāgnimitra*. The author introduces a dramatised version of Udayana's marriage with Vāsavadatta which was staged before the queen, Aranyikā playing the part of the queen and Udayana playing, by a secret device, his own part which role was given to a friend of Aranyikā. This incident furthers the progress of love as also the curing of Aranyikā from snake-bite by Udayana. Influences of the *Śākuntala* and *Malavikāgnimitra* are found in this play.

The *Nāgānanda* is a drama in five acts showing the self-sacrificing spirit of Jīmutavāhana, a prince of the Vidyādhara. The

Vidyādhara prince offers his life to Garuḍa as a victim in lieu of a snake Saṅkhacūḍa whose turn it was on that day to be the victim of Garuḍa. Ascertaining the noble behaviour of the prince, Garuḍa reforms himself and restoring to life all the snakes he had killed, avows in a Buddhist tone not to do injury to anyone. The prince who dies on the stage is brought back to life by the appearance of Gaurī and is made the Emperor of the Vidyādharas. The play involves the love of the prince for Malayavatī, a Siddha princess. The play is based on a Buddhist *Jātaka* to which a Hindu colouring is given by the dramatist probably to show his spirit of tolerance for both Hinduism and Buddhism.

Harṣa is not clever at the plot. He is diligent in borrowing from others and shaping them to suit his needs. In characterisation, the dramas suffer much. The women characters suffer most. The characters are called by the words 'Rājā', 'Nāyaka', 'Devī' and so on. The style belongs to the *Vaidarbhi* type. The sentiments are love in the *Ratnāvali* and the *Priyadarśikā* and calmness in the *Nāgānanda* which has a unique theme. Among the two love plays the *Ratnāvali* stands better by the graceful treatment of sentiment. The *Nāgānanda* does not rise to a high level as a drama. The various sentiments have not been fully developed. The author shows his acquaintance in the intricacies of music and astronomy.

Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa is the author of the *Veṇisamhāra* in six acts describing the events of the *Mahābhārata* war leading to the binding of the braid of Draupadī by Bhīma. He was invited by King Adīśura of Bengal to perform a sacrifice to avert the evil effects of a famine. This king lived about 650 A. D. Vāmana (c. 800 A. D.), is the earliest rhetorician to cite the passages from his play. His date may therefore be fixed about the latter half of the 7th century A. D. Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa has invented an incident in the theme of the epic which he gave as the title to his play. In the gambling hall, Draupadī lets loose her braid and avows not to tie it till Duryodhana falls down dead on the ground. After his death, Bhīma ties her hair and hence the title *Veṇisamhāra*. In order to achieve this purpose certain changes are introduced by the dramatist. Bhīma is glorified as he is connected with the incident of tying up the hair of Draupadī. Duryodhana's weaknesses are well-shown and to achieve this, the dramatist invents Bhānumatī, as the wife of Duryodhana and devotes the second act in showing Duryodhana as a sensual person. Karṇa is shown in black colours and this is achieved by the glorification of Aśvathāman. The chief merit of the play is individuality of characters, but the author does not give any clue as to who should be the hero. The chief sentiment is heroism and the style belongs to the *Gauḍa* type. His language

is forcible and is full of vigour. The play has many brilliant sentences but all of them are detached. There is no unity in plot structure.

Śaktibhadra, who is said to have been the pupil of Śaṅkara (632-664 A. D.), wrote a play called *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* in seven acts. This play exhibits many features in common with the plays which are ascribed to Bhāsa. It is learnt from the play, that it was the first drama to be written in South India. The date of the author may therefore be taken as C. 700 A. D. The title is derived from a miraculous crest-gem which was given to Rāma and Sītā by the hermits. With its help, Rāma and Sītā saved themselves from being deceived by the fictitious Rāma, Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa who were created by Rāvaṇa. From the prologue of the play, it appears that the author wrote another play called *Unmādavāsavadatta* which is now lost.

Yaśovarman, King of Kanauj, was a poet and a patron of poets. Bhavabhūti, the dramatist and Vākpati the *Prakṛta* poet were patronised by him. He was defeated in 733 A. D. by Lalitāditya. He wrote a play called *Rāmābhyudaya* in six acts on the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It is now lost and is known only from the quotations from it in the works of the rhetoricians.

Bhavabhūti was patronised by Yaśovarman. He was an elder contemporary of Vākpati. He may be taken to have lived about 700 A. D. He is the author of three plays *Mahāvīracarita*, *Mālatīmādhava*, and *Uttararāmacarita*. From the prologues to these plays, it is learnt that his name was Śrīkaṇṭha and that he acquired the title Bhavabhūti through his devotion to Śiva. He was the son of Nīlakaṇṭha and Jatukarṇī. He lived at Padmapura in the Vidarbha country. He was proficient in grammar, logic and *Mīmāṃsā*. He was deeply learned in rhetoric, *Upaniṣads*, *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*. He moved freely with the actors while he was young¹. His preceptor was one Jñānanidhi. A manuscript of the *Mālatīmādhava* mentions Umveka, a pupil of Kumārīlabhatta, as the author of the play. This has started a discussion about the identity of Bhavabhūti and Umveka (640-725 A. D.) which has not yet been proved.

The *Mahāvīracarita* appears to have been the first work of Bhavabhūti. In seven acts it contains a dramatised form of the story of Rāma from Sītā's marriage to Rāma's coronation. Rāvaṇa demands the hand of Sītā through his envoy but is disappointed by the bending of the bow by Rāma. Mālyvān, the minister of

1. अवभूतिर्नाम कविर्निर्गर्गसौहृदेन भरतेषु वर्तमानः ।

Rāvaṇa, prepares for revenge on Rāma. Surpaṇakhā appears at Mithilā in the guise of Mantharā, the servant of Kaikeyi and delivers to Daśaratha the demand for the two boons by Kaikeyī who does not attend the marriage. It is Mālyavān that persuades Vālin to attack Rāma who steps into Kiṣkindhā. Vālin's death at the hand of Rāma is justified thus providing no room for the thorny problem of Vālin's death as recorded in the epic. Rāma's return journey in an aerial car is described in the last act. The play is wholly undramatic. The wordy duel between Rāma and Paraśurāma takes two acts. The long speeches in the conversational style mar the effect of the play. It is held that the author wrote up to stanza 46 in Act IV and that one Subrahmanya wrote the remaining portion.

The *Mālatimādhava* is a *Prakarāṇa* in ten acts showing the circumstances which lead to the marriage of *Mādhava*, son or Devarāta, minister of the king of Vidarbha and *Mālatī*, the daughter of Bhurivasu, minister of the king of Padmāvatī and of Makaranda, a friend of *Mādhava* and *Madayantikā*, a friend of *Mālatī*. *Mādhava* came to Padmāvatī for studies. *Kāmandakī* a woman classmate of the fathers of *Mādhava* and *Mālatī* became a nun and was interested in the welfare of the children of her classmates. *Mādhava* happened one day to look at *Mālatī* and fell in love with her. *Mālatī* reciprocated *Mādhava*'s love but pressure was brought on her father by the royal house to give her in marriage to Nandana a king's favourite and brother of *Madayantikā*. In the marriage which was accordingly celebrated, Makaranda took the garb of a woman and married Nandana. A quarrel ensued between the wedded pair and the wife got separated from the husband. *Madayantikā* the sister of Nandana was saved one day from a tiger by Makaranda who after the incident fell in love with her. *Mālatī*, who was to have been married to Nandana was taken at the instructions of *Kāmandakī* to a monastery where a *Kāpālikā*, woman of the Pāśupata sect, carried her away to offer her to Śiva. *Mādhava*, coming to the spot by chance, saved her from the Pāśupata woman. Once again, *Mālatī* was stolen away by the revengeful Pāśupata follower and was rescued by the associate of *Kāmandakī*. Then there is happy reunion between the pairs. The plot is badly knit together. The pathos in the ninth act depicting the effect of *Mālatī*'s disappearance on the lover excels that in the 4th act of the *Vikramorvaśīya* but lacks the polish and grace in the latter. Influence of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandēśa* is found in the two stanzas of this act which form the message of *Mādhava* sent through the passing cloud to his absent beloved. The play has however many beautiful detached scenes.

The *Uttararāmacarita*, in seven acts portrays the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The meeting between Rāma and

his sons is effected with the aid of the sacred horse of the sacrifice which is pursued by the son of Lakṣmana and checked in its course by Lava with Kuśa who meets his father. The happy reunion between Rāma and Sītā is effected by the introduction of a small scene of the story of the epic in the last act. As a drama, the *Uttararāmacarita* does not rise to a high level. It is more a dramatic poem than a drama proper. The description of the forest and the protracture of the grief of Rāma and Sītā are admirable and unsurpassed. Rāma's meeting with his sons and with his wife in the hermitage of Sītā shows the influence of Kālidāsa.

All the three plays were enacted on the occasion of a festival of Kālapriyanātha at Ujjain. The scene of the *Mālatimādhava* is laid at Padmāvatī. The theme for the *Mālatimādhava* is invented by the dramatist while for the other two plays is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Bhavabhūti does not show any skill in the treatment of the plot nor does he maintain unity of time. This defect is made good by effective characterisation. His characters are all real with depth of feeling. One noteworthy feature in these plays is the absence of the Vidūṣaka. The dominant sentiments are love in the *Mālatimādhava*, heroism in the *Mahāvīracarita* and pathos in the *Uttararāmacarita*. He is equally good in the delineation of these sentiments as also of horror, disgust and others as evidenced in the *Mālatimādhava* but he excels others in the treatment of pathos. Vide :—काव्यं भवभूतिरेव तनुते । In the treatment of love, he did not care for the sensuous type and for the harem atmosphere. He chose to represent the ideal love between a man and a woman who remain chaste throughout their life. His style belongs to the *Gauḍī* type particularly in the *Mahāvīracarita* and the *Mālatimādhava*. It is rich, elevated, and vigorous and harmonious. The prose passages in his dramas except in the *Uttararāmacarita* are marred in their beauty by lengthy compounds written in a rugged form. His lines have more feeling than poetry. The *Śikharī* metre has been employed to perfection by him¹.

Among the dramatists, he comes next to Kālidāsa. He created his own path of style, and characterisation. Kālidāsa had an attraction for the milder aspects of nature but Bhavabhūti for the sublime and terrible aspects. Kālidāsa respected the conventions which were laid down by dramaturgy and therefore had to move within limits while Bhavabhūti violated them and chose to have a larger field to display his talents. For instance, contrary to conventions, he included in the *Mālatimādhava*, the appearance of a tiger, the scene of a cemetery and of the selling of human flesh. He gives realistic pictures of awful forests and the mountainous sites with ravines and precipices. Kālidāsa was gifted with more fancy and

1. Kṣemendra : *Suṛttatilaka* III 33.

imagination while Bhavabhuti was a master of expression, deep and forcible and full of sentiment. What Kālidāsa suggested in brief was expressed forcibly and elaborately by Bhavabhuti. Kālidāsa who had a determined optimistic outlook on life created his characters who were more romantic than real. Bhavabhuti, who appears to have suffered in the world and also disappointed¹, created characters who are more of the world than of a romantic realm. 'The description of the tender love of Rama and Sita, purified by sorrow, exhibits more genuine pathos than appears perhaps in any other Indian drama'². Kalidasa puts in the mouth of his characters some generalised statements of didactic nature but Bhavabhuti's sayings are the best when his characters speak of devotion to duty and self-sacrifice,³ true friendship,⁴ sincere love⁵ and the conception of the child.⁶ He has no humour but has dramatic irony. He displays his proficiency in the various branches of study like law, love, and *Vedānta*.

Anaṅgahaṛṣa Mātrārāja, who is quoted by Ānandavardhana (850 A. D.), wrote a play *Tāpasavatsarāja* in 6 acts. The exact date of the author is not ascertainable. He must have lived before 850 A. D. This play shows Udayana as wandering in the forest on hearing the report of the death of Vāsavadattā. He gets disgusted with life and becomes a sage. Finding his life miserable, he is about to throw himself into a river when Vāsavadatta who wanted to put an end to her wretched life comes there for the same purpose. The two meet each other in a happy mood giving up their resolves.

Māyurāja wrote a play called *Udattarāghava* on the *R māyāṇa* theme. This work is not now available. It is cited by Rājaśekhara (900 A. D.). Therefore the author must have lived before 900 A. D. Some critics identify Anaṅgahaṛṣa Mātrārāja with Māyruāja. Dāmodaragupta refers to Anaṅgahaṛṣa. If this identity is real, then the author of the *Tāpasavatsaraja* and *Udattaraghava* must have lived before 800 A. D. which is the date of Damodaragupta.

Kulaśekharavarman, a king of Kerala different from another king of Kerala with the same name who lived about 700 A. D. wrote two plays called *Subhadrādhhananjaya* and *Tapatīsamvaraṇa*. The author's date is given as c. 800 A. D.

1. *Mālatimādhava* I 8.

2. A. A. Macdonell : History of the Sanskrit Literature P. 365.

3. *Uttararāmacarita* I 12.

4. *Uttararāmacarita* IV 13, 14.

5. „ I 39.

6. „ III 18

Murāri was the son of Śrīvardhamanaka. He calls himself Bāla-vālmīki. He is cited in the *Haravijaya* of Ratnakara (850 A. D.) and he quotes from Bhavabhūti's (700 A. D.) *Uttararamacarita*. He may be taken to have lived about 800 A. D. He wrote the *Anar-gharāghava* a play in seven acts on the story of the *Rāmāyana*. In the treatment of the theme, he follows the *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhava-bhūti. In his description of the return journey in the last act, the author reveals his poor geographical knowledge. The author lacks all originality. The literary embellishments and the chaste style have won for him a unique admiration at the hands of the later day rhetoricians and grammarians.

Hanumān is known as the author of a play called *Mahānātaka* or *Hanumannātaka* on the story of the *Rāmāyana*. Hanumān, one of the characters in the *Rāmāyana* and an ardent devotee of Śrī Rāma, it is held, wrote an account of the life of his deity in the form of a drama. When he came to know that Valmiki was writing the epic, he thought that his composition would eclipse the sage's work and therefore cast it into the sea. At the instance of King Bhoja of Dhārā (1005—1054 A. D.), the play which was recorded in the rocks in fragments, was recast and was made available. This tradition would assign 1050 A. D. as the probable date of the text which is now available. Since Ānandavardhana (850 A. D.) refers to it, it must have been available in a fragmentary form before 850 A. D. The play is available in two recensions one prepared by Madhusudana in nine acts and the other by Damodaramiśra in fourteen acts. The play has no passage in *Prakṛta* and has no *Vidūṣaka*. There is little prose in the play which is of a narrative type.

Bhīmaṭa is referred to by Rājasekhara (900 A. D.) as the author of five plays. The date of Bhīmaṭa must therefore be before 900 A. D. All his plays are lost. Among the three of them *Svapnadaśānana*, *Pratibhūcāṇakya* and *Manoramāvatsarāja*, the *Svapnadaśānana* is supposed to have been the best.

Rājasekhara, who belonged to the Yāyāvārīya family, was the teacher of Nirbhaya (circa 895 A. D.) the Pratihara king. He must have lived about 900 A. D. He married Avantisundari an accomplished woman of the Cahamana family. From the prologue to his *Bālarāmāyana*, it is learnt that he wrote six plays, among which only four are available, viz., *Karpuramanjari*, *Bālarāmāyana*, *Viddhasālābhanjikā* and *Bālabhārata*.

The *Karpuramanjari* is his first play of the *Sattakā* type written by the dramatist at the request of his wife. It deals with the marriage of Prince Caṇḍapala and Princess Karpuramañjari. The incidents of *dohada*, imprisonment of the princess by the queen and similar others betray the influence of the *Mālavikāgni-mitra* and *Ratnāvali*. Each act is called *javanikāntara*. The

Bālarāmāyana is the second play written by the dramatist for Nirbhaya. In ten acts, it deals with the story of Rāma. It is called a *Mahānāṭaka*. The prologue assumes the dimension of an act in a drama and each act that of a *Nāṭikā*. Ravana, one of the suitors for the hand of Sītā, is disappointed on the occasion of the *svayamvara* of Sītā and departs avowing to kill any one who marries Sītā. Sītā's marriage is enacted in his presence at Lūh'kā. He falls in love with a wooden image of Sītā. Like Pururavas in the *Vikram-morvaśīya*, he wanders in the forest unable to bear the pangs of love for Sita. The last act deals with the return journey of Rāma in an aerial car and shows the poor geographical knowledge of the author. Ravana's love is given prominence in this play. The third play of the dramatist is *Viddhasālubhanjika*, a *Nāṭikā* in four acts. It shows how Prince Vidyadharamalla marries two princesses Mṛgaḥ-kavali and Kuvalayamala. The play is in imitation of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, *Ratnāvali* and *Svapnavāsavadatta*. The *Bālabhārata* which is also known as *Pracandapāṇḍava*, is in two acts on the life of the Paṇḍavas up to the incident of the gambling match. The *Haravilāsa* is the fifth play which is lost and is quoted by the rhetoricians of the later days. The name of the last play is not known.

Rajasekhara, who calls himself as Valmiki incarnate, is poor at the invention of the plot. He is skilled in making good use of a graceful style. He has to his credit a play written completely in *Prākṛta*. In his plays, he uses the words which were current in the Indian languages spoken in his time.

Ksemiśvara wrote the play *Candakaṣika* for King Mahipala of Kanauj (c. 914 A. D.) who was the patron of Rajasekhara. His date must therefore be about 900 A. D. The *Caṇḍakaṣika*, which is in five acts, deals with the story of Viśvamitra and Hariścandra. The authorship of the *Naisadhananda* in seven acts on the life of Nala is also attributed to him.

Lost in their originals but known from quotations are four plays *Taraṅgadatta*, *Puṣpaduṣitaka*, *Pāṇḍavānanda* and *Chalitarāma*. All these are quoted by Dhanika (c. 1000 A. D.) in his *Daśarupāvaloka*. The exact date of the composition of these plays cannot be ascertained but must have been written before (1000 A. D.) The authors of these are also not known. The *Taraṅgadatta* and the *Puṣpaduṣitaka* are *Prakarana*s. The former has for the heroine a courtesan and the latter has a woman of noble birth as its heroine. The latter deals with the love of Samudradatta, the friend of Muladeva. The other two plays *Pāṇḍavānanda* and *Chalitarāma* are based on the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyana* respectively.

Kṣemendra (1050 A. D.), wrote a number of works some among them being dramas. Most of these are now lost and are known only from his own citations from them in his works on rhetorics. The

Citrabhārata and *Kana'ajānaki* appear to be his two prominent dramas with their themes based on the two epics. Bilhana (1080 A. D.) wrote a *Nāṭikā* called *Karṇasundarī* dealing with the marriage of Kamadeva Trailokyamalla of Anhilvad in an advanced age with a princess Miyanalladevi of Karṇāṭa. In the beginning of the 12th century A. D., Śiṅkhaḍhara Kavirāja wrote a farce *Laṭakamelaka*. About the same period, Yaśaścandra son of Padmacandra wrote a play *Mudrītakumudacandra* dramatising the incident in which the Digambara Kumudacandra was silenced by the Śvetāmbara Devasurī. This incident took place in 1124 A. D. In the same century, Kañcanacarya also called Kañcanapaṇḍita wrote a *Vyāyoga* called *Dhanjayaviṇaya* dealing with Arjuna's success over the Kauravas who attempted to lift the cattle in the city of Virāṭa. Ramacandra, was the one-eyed pupil of the Jain Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.). He wrote about one hundred works. The well-known among his dramas are the *Nalavilāsa* in seven acts on the life of Nala, *Nirbhayabhīma* a *Vyāyoga* on the exploits of Bhīmasena, *Satyaharīścandra* in six acts on the vow of truth observed by Hariścandra and *Kaumudimitrananda* in ten acts based on the fable literature. Ramacandra is a master of elegant and effective expression.

Vigraharajadeva Viśaladeva was the king of the Cahamana family in the 12th century A. D. In 1153 A. D., he wrote the *Harakelināṭaka* on the fight between Arjuna and Śiva as hunter. This is partially preserved on stone at Ajmere. About the same period, Somadeva, who was patronised by Vigraharajadeva, wrote the *Lalita-vigraharajanāṭaka* on the love of his patron for Princess Deśaladevi. This play also is partially preserved on stone at Ajmere.

Vatsarāja was the minister of Paramardideva of Kālāñjara who ruled from 1163 A. D. to 1203 A. D. He was a poet and has to his credit six plays each representing one rare type of the dramas. The *Kiratarjuniya*, which is based on the poem of Bharavi, belongs to the *Vyayoga* type; *Karpuracarita* a *bhāṇa*, *Hāsyacudāmaṇi* a farce, *Rukminiharaṇa*, an *lḥāmṛga* in four acts on the forcible carrying away of Rukmiṇi by Kṛṣṇa, *Tripuradāha*, a *Dima* in four acts on the destruction of the three cities by Śiva and *Samudramathana* a *Samavākāra* in three acts on the churning of the ocean.

Jayadeva son of Mahadeva and Sumitra, lived in the first half of the 13th century A. D. He was a great logician, rhetorician and dramatist. He acquired the titles Pakṣadharamiśra for his proficiency in logic, and Piyaṣavarṣa for his elegant lyrical verses in his drama *Prasannarāghava*. The play, which is in seven acts, is based on the theme of the *Rāmayaṇa*. Ravana and another demon Bāṇa are made the rival suitors for the hand of Sītā. It is in complete imita-

tion of the *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhavabhūti. It abounds in elegant lyrical verses and mostly undramatic stanzas.

In 1213 A. D., Madana a poet, who had the title Balasarasvati and who was patronised by his pupil Arjunavarman of the Paramara dynasty, wrote a *Nāṭikā* in four acts called *Pārijātamañjarī* also called *Vijayaśrī*. It shows how a garland, which fell on the chest of Arjunavarman, was changed into a maiden whose marriage with him takes place. The two acts of this play are preserved on stone at Dhara. Jayasimhasuri a Śvetāmbara Jain wrote in 1230 A. D. the *Hammiramadamardana* a play in five acts on the defeat inflicted by Viradhavala ruler of Dholka on the Mohammedans who invaded Gujarat.

Prahladana was the brother of Dharādhavala of the Paramara dynasty. He was the Yuvaraja under his brother about 1300 A. D. His *Pārthaparākrama* is a *Vyāyoga* on Arjuna's prowess when the Kauravas lifted the cattle in the land of the king of Virāṭa, Mokṣaditya's *Bhimavikrama* a *vyayoga* is on the prowess of Bhimasena. The date of the earliest manuscript of this play is 1328 A. D. The author must have lived before this date. Ramabhadramuni, a Jain monk and pupil of Jayaprabhasuri, wrote about 1300 A. D., the *Prabuddharauhiṇya* in six acts on the daring deeds of the robber Rauhiṇya. Ravivarman, a Kerala prince wrote about 1300 A. D., the *Pradyumnābhyaudaya* in five acts on the destruction of Vajranabha, King of Vajrapura and on the marriage of Pradyumna a prince with a princess Prabhavati by name. Vidyanatha's (1300 A. D.) *Pratāparudriyakalyāṇa* dealing in five acts on the accession to the throne of King Pratāparudra of Warangal (1294—1325 A. D.), is included in his own *Pratāparudriyayaśobhuṣaṇa* a work on rhetorics. The purpose of the author in writing this play was to illustrate the rules of dramaturgy which he laid down in his work on rhetorics. Narasimha was the nephew of Agastya also known as Vidyanatha. He wrote about 1350 A. D. the *Kādambarikalyāṇa* a play in eight acts which dramatises the story of Baṇa's *Kādambarī*. Viśvanatha the brother of Narasimha and the preceptor of Gaṅgadevi the authoress of the *Mathurāvijaya*, wrote about 1350 A. D. the *Saugandhikāharaṇa* a *Vyāyoga* on the bringing of the Saugandhika flower by Bhima at the bidding of Draupadī. Jyotirīśvara, who had the title Kaviśekhara, is known as the author of a farce *Dhurtasamāgama*. He lived in the first half of the 14th century A. D. Bhaskara's *Unmattarāghava* in one act belongs to the *Aṅka* type and deals with the sad lot of Rama who goes mad at the separation of Sita. The identity of the author cannot be easily established. If Vidyanāya, referred to in this play, were identical with the famous scholar of that name who lived at Vijayanagar, then the date of the author could be fixed about 1350 A. D. Sita disappears while she enters into a garden into which the entry of woman is forbidden. Agastya the sage takes

pity on Rama and restores her to him. The whole play is in imitation of the IV act of the *Vikramorvaśīya*. Virupakṣa, son of Harihara II of Vijayanagar, is known as the author of the *Unmattarāghava* in one act. The date of the author appears to have been in the latter half of the 14th century A. D. The play belongs to the *Prekṣaṇaka* type. Lakṣmaṇa attacked Ravana who carried away Sita and killed him. Rama, who was in a maddened state, got back to the normal condition when Sita was brought to him by Lakṣmaṇa. It is influenced by the IV act of the *Vikramorvaśīya*. The *Nārāyanavilāsa* is the other play of the same dramatist. The *Bhairavānanda* which deals with the love of Bhairava for a celestial woman Madanavati was written towards the close of the 14th century A. D. by the Nepalese poet Manika. The *Mallikāmaruta* is a *Prakarna* in ten acts by Uddaṇḍa (c. 1400 A. D.), the author of the *Kokilasandēśa* which is in slavish imitation of the *Malatīmādhava*. Kaśipati Kavirāja wrote a *Bhaṇa* called *Mukundānanda*. The date of the author cannot be before the 13th century A. D. Vamanabhaṭṭabāṇa (circa 1420 A. D.) wrote the *Parvatipariṇaya*, *Kanakalekhakalyāṇa* and *Sṛṅglārabhuṣaṇobhaṇa*. The *Parvatipariṇaya* in five acts describes Parvati's wedding with Śiva. It is based on the *Kumarasambhava*. The *Kanakalekhakalyāṇa* is a *Natika* in four acts. The *Sṛṅgarabhuṣaṇabhaṇa* is a *Bhaṇa*. The *Gangādāsaprataṭṭapavilāsa* by G. Ṭṛgadhara deals with the struggle between Campanir prince and a Shah of Gujarat which took place about 1450 A. D. The *Bhartr̥harinirveda* of Harihara in 5 acts shows how King Bhartr̥hari got renunciation. The date of the work may be fixed in the early part of the 15th century A. D. Rupagosvamin (c. 1500 A. D.) who was a pupil of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya is known as the author of the *Vidagdhamādhava* in seven acts, *Lalitamādhava* in ten acts and *Dana'elikaumudī* a *Bhaṇa*. All these plays are in praise of Kṛṣṇa. The *Muditmadālasā* in seven acts by Gokulanatha belongs to the same period. The *Kamsavadh* of Śeṣakṛṣṇa (c. 1600 A. D.) has seven acts and describes the death of Kamsa at the hands of Kṛṣṇa and the coronation of Ugrasena, father of Kamsa. The *Bhaimipariṇaya* on Damanyanti's marriage with Nala is a drama from the pen of Ratnakheṭa Śrinivasadikṣita (c. 1570 A. D.) an elder contemporary of Appayadikṣita. On the life of King Raghunatha Naik of Tanjore (1614 - 1632 A. D.), was written the play *Raghunathavilāsa* by Yajñanarayanadikṣita, son of Govindadikṣita. The date of the composition may be c. 1630 A. D. In the early part of the same century, Jagajjyotirmalla a tributary prince of Nepal wrote the *Haragaurivivāha* which could be called an opera. Gururama (c. 1630 A. D.) is known as the author of a *Bhaṇa* called *Madanagopalavilāsa*, a drama in five acts called *Subhadradhanjaya* and another play *Ratneśvaraprasadana* in five acts. During the same period, did Rajacudamanīdikṣita write the *Anandarāghavanata'la*, *Kamalinikalahamsanataka* and *Sṛnagarasarvasabhāṇa*. The *Nalacarita* on the life of Nala was written by Nilakanthadikṣita (c. 1650 A. D.) the author of the *Sizalilaraṇa*. It has six acts and

looks incomplete. On the marriage of Pradyumna with Rati, Venkatadhvarin, (c. 1650 A. D.) the author of the *Viśvagunadaṛṣa*, wrote a play *Pradyumnānanda* in six acts. Rudradāsa's *Candralekha* a *Sattaka* on the marriage of Candralekha and Manavedaraja belongs to this period. Mahadeva (c. 1650 A. D.) dealt with the story of Rama in a ten act play called *Adbhutadarpaṇa* in which the happenings at Lankā are shown as though with the aid of a magic mirror. The figure of the Vidūṣaka is introduced here. Ramabhadradikṣita (1700 A. D.) is known as the author of the *Janakiparinaya* in which a set of unreal characters is introduced. Vidyujjihva a demon of Lankā, Ravana, Śravana and Tātaka appear respectively as Viśvamitra, Rama, Lakṣmaṇa and Sita. They come to Viśvamitra's hermitage to deceive by their appearances Rama Lakṣmaṇa and Sita. Surpinakha approaches Bhārata in the guise of an ascetic woman and attempts to bring about his death by spreading the false report of Rama's death. The mischief is found out and the attempt of the demons is foiled by the arrival of Rama at Ayodhya. Then the coronation takes place. The dramatist has to his credit a *Bhaṇa* called *Śṛṅgratila'a* also called *Ayyabhana* since the author was known as Ayya. A play called *Subhadrāparinaya* and a *Bhaṇa* called *Śṛṅgarasarvasva* are attributed to the authorship of Nalla kavi (circa 1700 A. D.) At about the same date were written a *Prahasana* called *Kautukaratna'ara* by Kavitarika and a *Prahasana* called *Dhūrtanarta'a* and a play *Sridamacarita* in five acts on the life of Kucela whose real name was Sridaman or Sudaman by *Samarajadikṣita*. The *Rukminiparinaya* a play, *Navamālikā* a *Nāṭika* and *Śṛṅgarāmanjari* a *Sattaka* were written by Viśveśvara in the beginning of the 18th century. The *Balamartandavijaya* of Devaraja in the latter half of the 18th century describes in five acts the victorious career of his patron Martandavarman King of Travancore. The *Vasantatilakabhana* of Varadacarya belongs to the same period. It is also called *Ammabhana*. Ghanaśyama was the minister of King Tukoji of Tanjore in the same period. His accomplished wives Sundari and Kamla wrote a commentary on the *Viddhasalabhanjika* of Rajaśekhara. He is said to have written more than one hundred works some of them in *Sanskṛta*, *Prakṛta* and the dialects. Some of these are commentaries on the works of ancient poets. Chief among his works are a *Bhaṇa* called *Madanasanjivana*, two *Sattakas* *Navagrahacarita* and *Ānandasundari* and a *Prahasana* called *Damaruka*. The *Rukminiparinaya* and *Śṛṅgarasudhakara* are the two among other plays which were written by Rāmavarman the Yavaraaja of Travancore (1757—1789 A. D.). In imitation of the *Ratnavali* of Haṛṣa was written about the same period the *Mṛgaṇalalekhanatika* in four acts by Viśvanatha. The *Manmathonmathana* of Rama (circa 1820 A. D.) belongs to the *Dima* type of plays. A prince of Koṭilingapura (modern Cranganore) wrote about 1850 A. D. some poems and dramas, the prominent among them being the *Rasasadanabhana*.

Prominent among the dramas of uncertain date are the *Vr̥ṣa-bhānuja a Nāṭikā* by Mathurādāsa, the *Hasyārṇava* by Jagadīśa, a *Prahasna*, *Kautukasarvasva* a *Prahāsana* by Gopīnāthacakravartin, *Kalyāṇasaugandhika* of Nīlakaṇṭha, *Śivanārāyaṇabhaṇḍama-hodaya* a *Nāṭikā* of philosophical import by Narasimha, *Kṛṣṇābhyudaya* of the *Prekṣāṇaka* type by Lokanāthabhaṭṭa; *Sarvavinodanāṭaka* an *Ihāmṛga* by Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Ghaṭikāśata kavi, *Viravijaya* *Ionāmṛga* by Kṛṣṇamiśra; *Śāradātilaka* a *Bhāṇā* by Śaṅkara; *Gopālakedrikā* of irregular type by Rāmakṛṣṇa and the *Subhadrāharana* of the *Śrīgadita* type by Mādhava.

ALLEGORICAL PLAYS

From the earliest period of the development of the *Saṁskṛta* literature, there had been growing a tendency on the part of the poets and scholars to personify inanimate objects and personal qualities. The growth and development of the various systems of thought, and the need for the preaching of moral standards gave strength and support to this kind of personification. Such personified objects came to gain room in the dramas playing the part of characters. So, in plays which gave scope for these personified objects and qualities, generally the characters are *Viveka* (discrimination), *Moha* (confusion), *Kama* (cupid), *Dumbha* (falsity), *Ahaṅkāra* (egoism), *Śraddhā* (faith) and others.

Aśvaghoṣa's play of unknown title which is available in fragments represents the earliest text. Kṛṣṇamiśra wrote the *Prabodha-candrodaya* an allegorical play in six acts for one Gopāla under Kīrtivarman about whom there is an inscription dated 1098 A. D. There is a war between *Vivekā* and *Mahāmoha*. It is put to an end by the rise of the moon in the form of *Prabodha* (knowledge). The aim of the author is to show the greatness of the *Advaita* system of philosophy and to emphasise on the need of devotion to Viṣṇu as the means to reach the goal. The dialogues in which the Jains, Buddhists and Kāpālikas participate are highly interesting. Yaśahpāla a Jain wrote between 1229-32 A. D. his *Mohamudgara* in 5 acts on the religious conversion of Kumārapāla of Anhilvad. In the first half of the 14th century the allegorical play called *San̄kalpasūryodaya* was written by Vedāntadeśika. The title suggests the rise of the sun in the form of *San̄kalpa* (divine will). The play, which is in ten acts, upholds the view of the *Viṣiṭādvaita* system of *Vedānta*. *Śānta* is the main sentiment for the recognition of which the author puts forward its claims¹. The lives of the fraudulent and the haughty are vividly described exposing their weakness. Tumburu, Nārada and others appear on the stage. The happy end is brought about

1. Vedāntadeśika's *San̄kalpasūryodaya* I—19.

by *Viṣṇubhakti*. The *Amṛtodaya* was written in the 16th century by Gokulanātha. It deals with the miseries of the world and affords solution for them. *Ānvīkṣiki*, *Mīmāṃsā*, *Śruti* and others are the characters in this play. Ratnakheṭa Śrīnivāsadīkṣita (c 1570 A. D.) wrote the *Bhāṛanāpuruṣottama*. At about the same period was composed the *Caitanyacandrodaya* by Kavikarṇapūra on the religious traditions of the Caitanya cult. The *Vidyāpariṇaya* in seven acts on the marriage between learning and the individual soul was composed by Vedakavi (1684—1728 A. D.). The same writer wrote the *Jivānandanam* in seven acts on the values of medical science and the *Vedānta* system of thought. According to some scholars, these two, which were written by Vedakavi, were ascribed to the authorship of Anandarāyamakhin, minister of Shahaji (1684—1710 A. D.) the Maharatta King of Tanjore. The *Dharmavijayanāṭaka* of Bhūdeva sukla which was written in 1737 A. D. brings out vividly the religious practices of this period.

CHĀYĀ NĀṬAKA

The shadow-play is of recent origin and finds no mention in the early dramatic treatises. Images made of card boards are placed on the screen and are made to move by means of threads, the dialogues being repeated by persons behind the curtain. This represents the initial stage in the development of modern talkies. The later origin of this type of play is revealed by the absence of works belonging to this type in the early period. The exact date when it became popular or imported to India cannot be ascertained. There are available veiled references to this type in the *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinava gupta (1000 A. D.).

The *Dharmābhyudaya* of Meghaprabhācārya is mentioned in its prologue as the *Chāyānāṭaka*. The date of the work is not known. The *Dūtāṅgada* of Subhata, which deals with Aṅgada's mission to Rāvaṇa, was shown on the stage in 1243 A. D. The author appears to have lived about 1200 A. D. Vyāsa Śrīrāmadeva, who lived in the first half of the 15th century, wrote three plays of this type *Subhadrāpariṇaya*, *Rāmābhyudaya* and *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*. The other plays under this head are of insignificant value.

DECLINE OF THE SĀMSKRĪTA DRAMA

The decadence of the *Sāmskrīta* drama may be accounted for due to several causes. The influence of the epics did not permit the rising dramatists to choose a theme of their own. The result was that too many dramas bearing the same title and dealing with the same theme came to be written. The rules of dramaturgy became more and more rigid with the production of more and

more dramas. The dramatists found themselves hard to follow minutely the rigid convention and thus had to produce dramas of stereotyped form. The language, which was made artificial by the poets and dramatists who aimed at the production of compositions by using farfetched expressions, became totally ununderstandable to the audience. The audience which was cultured and fastidious was mainly responsible for the artificialities which have set in the later dramas. All these causes made the writing of a drama very difficult for a beginner. Besides, the drama, which is intimately connected with the Hindu religion both in outlook and purpose, began to lose its importance in the literary and secular spheres of Hindu life at the time when the Muslims conquerors established their hold in India. They did not actively favour those factors which were conducive to the maintenance and propagation of the Hindu religion to thrive. In spite of these set backs, the dramas were continued to be written till the establishment of the British rule when encouragement for the poets from patrons ceased due to the weakening of the Indian states and when the members of the cultured classes, gave up their traditional pursuits in order to train themselves in large numbers to serve the country under the guidance of an alien race holding a cultural outlook different from their own.

CHAPTER XXIV

HISTORY

It is surprising to note that while every branch of study is represented in *Saṃskṛta*, history as a separate subject is not found to have been treated. The critics of the West account for this paucity of historical texts as due to the Indian's psychological bent which is against writing history. The Indian mind believes in the workings of fate, doctrine of *karma*, intervention of the superhuman elements in the daily life, and the impermanence of the world. These deep rooted beliefs do not permit to appreciate or take into account the contemporary happenings. Man has no independent power to act or guide others. He is a tool in the hands of others. Therefore his achievements or reverses are to be accounted for as due to his virtue or vice and hence are not worth recording. Besides, everything being sure to decay, no purpose would be served by the recording of a worldly event. Moreover, to the Indian mind, the heroes of the past, like Rāma, Arjuna, Bhīma, Karna and others appear as great in spite of the long distance of time which separates them and contemporary heroes appear as non-entities in comparison to them. Hence the contemporary heroes and their achievements were not cared for and were not treated in the compositions. There were always hosts of scholars who would sing the glory of the heroes of the past, compose poems on them and comment on the works of earlier writers. To the critics of the West, Kalhaṇa the Kashmirian writer is the nearest approach to the historian. Even he, who had unflinching faith in supernatural happenings, could not have appreciated the value of historical events. Therefore the facts of historical importance as given by him are to be considered as gross exaggerations of the real events.

Really speaking, India did not produce works on history. It did not have the historical sense in the sense in which it is understood by the Western critics. The Indian mind is of course opposed to the writing of history. However, there were attempts made to write history, and to record contemporary happenings but all these were done in a way peculiar to India. While matter is of more importance than the form which presents the historical fact in the historical texts of the West, India gives prominence to form although matter is not utterly ignored. Whatever is presented takes the shape of prose, poetry, *campu* or *drāma*. The minute rules of the composition of these are followed. The authors of works on history were poets who were under the patronage of royal houses and therefore they had to include in their works only such materials which would be

pleasing to their patrons and in such a manner as not to wound their feelings. Naturally an impartial account of certain historical facts could hardly be expected from them. Still, some authors have been sincere in their recording of events. These writers could not be condemned as lacking in the appreciation of historical sense on the ground that they had their own beliefs and faiths, for their faith in certain traditions is deep-rooted by age-long experiences. It can therefore be said that India produced history not in the sense as understood by the Western critics.

The chief difficulty which hinders the appreciation of a work on history is the absence of uniform chronology. There was in use a number of eras some of which started with certain dynasties. The dates are indicated with the aid of chronograms.

In the larger sense of the word, history is found represented in many forms of literature. The epics and the *Purāṇas* contain accounts of historical interest. The accounts of the Buddha and of the Jain saints are also of historical interest *e.g.*, the works of Asva-ghoṣa, of Hemacandra and others. These, together with the *Purāṇas*, the inscriptions of Rudradāman and others, may be taken to represent history.

The earliest work, which may represent history, is the *Kaumudī-mahotsava* which throws light on the political intrigues in the Gupta period. The *Mattavilasaprahasana* of Mahendravikraman of Kāñcī brings out vividly the degeneration that has set in the practises of the followers of the various religious sects. Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* has autobiographical and biographical elements. It is more a poem on history than a work on history. The author does not make clear certain points presented by him in the work. Why was Rājyaśrī's husband murdered? What was the exact nature of the treacherous act of the Gauda prince? Who were the poets under Harṣa's patronage? The author does not give any information on these points. Of course, his introductory verses are helpful in knowing who his predecessors were in his field. Even the other events of historical interest are given a poetic colouring. It is however very valuable to understand the customs and manners of the Indians in the 7th century A. D. "What he does supply to history is the vivid pictures of the army, of the life of the court, of the sectaries and their relations to the Buddhists, and the avocations of a Brahmin and his friends." The *Gauda-aho* of Vākpāti is also historical in treatment. It does not give the date of the defeat of Yaśovarman. Kanakasenavādirāja's *Yasodharacarita* has both historical and religious aspects. From Kalhaṇa, it is learnt that one Śaṅkuka wrote a poem called *Bhuvanābhyudaya* describing the battle which took place between Mamma and Utpala in 850 A. D. The work is now lost. Padmagupta's *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* has some historically interesting facts. Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* is

of historical interest. His patron Vikramāṅka or Vikramāditya became the king through the command of Śiva who appeared thrice to put forth the claims of the prince for occupying the throne. He had to fight constantly with his elder brother Someśvara and the younger brother Jayasimha. He had to take expeditions against the Colas. The last canto is useful as a piece of autobiography. The author does not however give dates. Bilhana's *Karnasundarī*, a *Nāṭikā*, though not historical in treatment, has historical interest as it suggests the marriage of Karṇadeva Trailokyamalla of Anhilvad in his advanced age with Miyanalladevi a Karṇāṭaka princess. Similar is the nature of the *Dvyaśrayakāvya* of Hemacandra. The *Mudritakumudacandra* of Yaśascandra is historical from the religious point of view. The last canto in the *Śrīkaṭhacarita* contains an account of the poets in the court of Aluṅkāra, minister of Jayasimha of Kashmir. The *Somapālavilāsa* of Jalhana deals with the history of King Somapāla of Rājapurī who patronised Jalhana.

Kalhana can be called the greatest historian of India. He tells that he consulted eleven earlier historians and the *Nīlamatapurāṇa* before writing the *Rājataranginī*. He begins with King Gonanda and ends with the accession of Jayasimha in Kashmir. He left his work incomplete. In spite of his being a native of Kashmir he brings out vividly the petty politics of Kashmir. He rises above vanity. He condemns certain kings for not having taken precautions to check the plans of their enemies. The soldiers and the servants during his days were disloyal. They betrayed their masters and joined the opposing party. Kalhana draws a line of contrast between their behaviour and that of the Rajputs and foreigners. The state officials were greedy, oppressive and disloyal. The state was full of rival ministers, greedy soldiers, intriguing priests, uncontrolled chieftains and pleasure-loving subjects. Treachery, intrigue, murder, suicide, and family quarrels were the main features of life in Kashmir. Kalhana takes a dispassionate view of the happenings in Kashmir. His findings are corroborated by the records of history. He lays stress on the impermanence of the world. As a work on history, the *Rājataranginī* is of high value, yet, the early history of Kashmir is shrouded in mystery. His work, which he left incomplete, was continued by Jonarāja, Śrīvara, Prajyabhaṭṭa and Suka. The history of Rāmapāla of Bengal (1104—1130 A. D.) is dealt in the *Rāmapālacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin. The *Prthvirājaviṇaya*, *Jayantaviṇaya*, *Sukṛtasāṅkirtana*, *Hammira-madamardana*, *Vasantavilāsa*, *Surathotsava*, *Kīrtikaumudī*, the allegorical play *Mohaparajaya*, *Candraprabhacarita*, *Jagadūcarita* and others deal with matters of historical interest. Reliable historical matters are treated in the *Mathurāviṇaya* of Gaṅgadevī, *Saluvābhuydaya* of Rājanātha II, and *Acyutarābhuydaya* of Rājānātha III, all the three works throwing much light on the achievement, of

the ruling dynasty of Vijayanagar The *Gaṅgā* dynasty is treated by Vasudevaratha in the *Gaṅgāvaṃśānucarita* and Gaṅgādhara in the *Gaṅgādāsapratāpavilāsa* The *Varadāmbikāpariṇaya* of Tirumalāmbā and *Vemabhūpālacarita* of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa have connections with the lives of historical persons. The *Sahityaratnākara* and *Raghunāthavilāsa* of Yajñanārāyaṇa and *Raghunāthābhyudaya* of Rāmahadrāmbā deal with the achievements of Raghunātha Naik (1614 – 1632 . A. D. of Tanjore. Of similar importance are the *Rāṣṭraudhavaṃśamahākāvya* of Rudrakavi, *Hīrasaubhāgya* of Devavimalagaṇi, *Bālamārtāṇḍariya* of Devarāja and *Citracampū* of Bāṇeśvara.

The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, which was written in 1306 A. D. by Merutuṅga, contains biographical accounts of the Jain saints, poets and patrons of Jainism. Similar in treatment is the *Prabandhakośa* which was completed in 1349 A. D. by Rājasekhara.

CHAPTER XXV

THEORIES OF POETRY AND DRAMA

With the growth and development of poems and dramas, a need was felt among those who were the composers and the critics, to frame certain rules both to guide the novices and to check the form and nature of the compositions from becoming untelligible to posterity. The rules of dramaturgy took precedence over those of poems. The figures of speech also were given some importance as they were intended to maintain and keep up the standard of sentiment. This branch of study came to acquire the name *Alaṅkāra* on account of the importance given to the figures of speech. It is also called the branch of *Sāhitya* because of the stress it lays on the inseparable relation between a word and its meaning. Generally speaking, the following topics are dealt with in this branch of study :—The theory and definition of poetry, denotations of words, the nature and varieties of the characters like hero, heroine and others, sentiment, qualities and blemishes, dramaturgy and figures of speech.

Attempts were made at different periods during the development of this branch to determine what constitutes the essence of poetry and to devise means to achieve it. The excellence of a poem or drama was looked at from various angles and the results achieved are also varied. The results, thus arrived at, formed the basis for the starting of a school of theory on poetics and dramas. There arose eight schools called the schools of *Rīti*, *Rasa*, *Alaṅkāra*, *Dhavanī*, *Vakrokti*, *Guṇa*, *Anumāna* and *Aucitya*.

The *Rīti* school holds that the style or manner (*rīti*) contributes to the excellence of a literary composition. In the beginning two styles viz. *Vaidarbhī* and *Gauḍī* were recognised. The *Vaidarbhī* which gave importance to polish and grace represented the style *par excellence*. The place of origin of this style was *Vidarbha* and hence its name. The other style *Gauḍī* took its origin in Bengal and was characterised by high exaggeration, force and bombast. While the *Vaidarbhī* laid more stress on sense, the *Gauḍī* was more fond of sound. These two styles were in existence before 600 A. D. Daṇḍin (c. 700 A. D.) tells that cohesion (*śleṣa*), lucidity (*prasāda*), evenness (*samatā*), sweetness (*mādhurya*), tenderness (*sukumāratā*), explicitness of meaning (*udāratva*), floridity (*ojas*), grace (*kānti*) and transference (*samā-dhi*) are the ten qualities (*guṇas*) forming the very life of the *Vaidarbhī* style. Daṇḍin (c. 700 A. D.) and Vāmana (c. 800 A. D.) were

the chief exponents of this school. Vāmana held *riti* as the soul of a poem. After 800 A. D., four more styles came into being and were placed in between the *Vaidarbhi* and *Gaudī* styles. They were the *Pāñchālī*, *Lāṭī*, *Āvanti* and *Māgadhi* called after the names of the regions where they rose up. This school lost its hold after 800 A. D. since, sentiment, which is an important factor in the literary compositions, was not treated by the exponents of this school.

The *Rasa* school holds that the soul of a literary composition lies in its sentiment (*rasa*). 'Sentiment is a condition in the mind of the spectator of a drama, or, we may add, the hearer or reader of a poem produced by the emotions of the characters, and the emotions. *Bhāvas* are excited by factors which may either be the object of the emotion, as the loved one is in the case of love, or serve to heighten it, as does the spring season.'¹ These factors are respectively called *ālambanavibhāva* and *uddipyanavibhāva*. The result of the workings of these factors, is manifested in the form of fainting, fatigue, tremor, and others. All these produce a dominant emotion (*sthāyī bhāva*) which, in its final stage of growth, acquires the name sentiment. Sentiments are eight in number viz., love (*śṛṅgāra*), comic (*hāsyā*), pathos (*karuṇā*), horror (*raudra*), heroism (*vīra*), fear (*bhayānaka*), disgust (*bībhatsā*) and wonder (*adbhuta*). *Śānta* was added as the ninth at a later stage. These are mentioned in a passage which occurs in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

Vide :—

शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणा रौद्रवीरभयानकाः ।

बीभत्साद्भुतशान्ताश्च रसाः पूर्वमुदाहृताः ॥

The corrupt text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* does not make it clear whether *śānta* was recognised by Bharata as a sentiment. Bharata recognises, of course, *śānta* (calmness) as the dominant emotion. Ascetic elements which have existed from very ancient times should have, under the influence of the *Mahābhārata*, given rise to this sentiment. The claim of *śānta* to be treated as a sentiment cannot be denied on the ground that it has a limited appeal, as some critics hold, for the test for the value of a sentiment does not lie only in its appeal to large audience. *Śānta* is the main sentiment in the *Nāgānanda* of Harṣa who is said to have commented on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. It is probable that this play started the inquiry of the claims of *śānta* to be treated as a sentiment. Udbhaṭa was the earliest writer to mention *śānta* as a sentiment.

Different were the views expressed by certain writers as to the mode of experiencing a sentiment. Lollaṭa held that sentiment belongs to the actor. The spectator is delighted when he finds the

1. A. B. Keith : History of Sanskrit Literature pp. 372-73.

actor show the same mental attitude which originally belonged to the person whose part he plays. Śaṅkuka held that the clever gestulation of the actor makes it possible for the spectator to infer that the actor is not different from the person whose part he plays. The spectator feels the sentiment through inference. According to Bhaṭṭanāyaka, sentiment can neither be perceived nor produced but could be appreciated through the denotation of words, the ability of the spectator to generalise the particular instance and the capacity of the audience to enjoy it. Abhinavagupta held the view that the spectator gets delight through suggestion. This *rasa* school is represented by the above-mentioned writers, and Rudrabhaṭṭa, Bhoja, Śāradātanaya and others.

The *Alankāra* school took into account the factors which beautify a composition. They were aware of the significance of sentiment in a composition but subordinated it to the figure of speech. These embellishments were based on sound and sense and came to be called *Arthālankāra* and *Śabdālankāra*. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin were the earliest to treat these figures. The number of figures went on increasing from time to time and exceeded two hundred at the hands of later writers.

The *Vakrokti* school is only an offshoot of the *Alankāra* school. The word '*vakrokti*' means utterance which differs from the ordinary mode of speech. The figures of speech are said to gain perfection by the use of the *vakrokti* mode of utterance. It came to be recognised as a separate figure of speech. A literary composition has its soul in *vakrokti* (turn of expression). Bhāmaha and Kuntaka were the chief upholders of this theory.

The *Dhavanī* school attaches importance to the suggested sense of words. This doctrine is based on the analysis of words and their meaning. Words have three kinds of denotation viz, primary, secondary and suggested. They are respectively called *abidhā*, and *lakṣaṇā* and *vyanjanā*. The secondary denotation is resorted to where the primary meaning does not indicate any sense. For example the passage 'a station of herdsmen on the Gaṅgā' could not mean 'on the stream of the Gaṅgā' but on the banks of the Gaṅgā' where it is possible for the station of the herdsmen to exist. The suggested denotation is found to be useful in the case of certain words which when uttered indicate some other sense not directly denoted by them. In other words, what is expressed brings to the mind, in addition to its sense, something that is not expressed. In this respect, this doctrine is closely connected and was influenced by the doctrine of *sphoṭa* of the grammarians. The upholders of this doctrine of *Dhavanī* or *Vyanjanā* as it is called, declare suggestion as the soul of the poem. A literary piece without suggestion is to be deemed as dead. What is suggested may be sentiment or figure of speech and it cannot be expressed by means of words. The experience of it comes

within the province of personal observation and as such cannot be had by all. It is limited to those, who had similar experiences in the previous births and therefore could have a taste of them when they are repeated. Such experiences, when they are to be had through the actors on the stages, are treated by these men of taste not as belonging to the actors or themselves but as universal. The men of taste have supreme bliss through these experiences which they derive from the stage or from reading a poem. Hence the feelings, though painful, give to the man of taste a strange pleasure. Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta were the chief exponents of this doctrine. Abhinavagupta simplified this doctrine by restricting its scope to sentiment. The suggestion of the figures of speech, of the meaning and others depends on that of sentiment. The qualities (*guṇas*) and figures of speech are related to sentiment. The advocates of this school have classified the literary compositions into three classes according to the importance given to suggestion in them. The three classes are the *Dhvanikāvya* in which suggestion is given prominence, *Guṇībhūtavyangya* in which it has a subordinate place and *Citra* in which it is totally absent. When sentiment is to be suggested, long compounds ought not to be used even in prose.

Among the other schools, that of *guṇa* had close association with that of *riti* Dandin being a leading exponent, that of *anumāna* was related to that of *rasa* with Sankuka and Mahimabhatta as the exponents and that of *aucitya*, which stressed on propriety as the main factor contributing to the excellence of the work and advocated by Ksemendra who took the hint for his theory from earlier writers.

The earliest authority whose work is now available is Bharata. He wrote the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. He lived long before the Christian era. Since Kalidāsa refers to him¹ he must have lived about 400 B. C. or even earlier. The text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* which is now available in 37 chapters has many passages interpolated at different periods. The date of the text may be placed about 400 B. C. but it cannot be said definitely what the original passages of Bharata are. Nandikeśvara, Nārada and others are considered to have been the ancient exponents of the science of poetics before Bharata. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* deals with dramatic representations including stage arrangements, dancing and music. As far as the theories of poetry and drama are concerned, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* attaches importance to the development of sentiment. Bharata speaks of the ten qualities (*Guṇas*) and *Rūpaka*, *Upamā*, *Dīpaka* and *Yamaka*, the four figures of speech as aids to perfect sentiment. He enumerates the defects which are to be avoided in a composition. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* has many commentaries. *Bharataṭṭka* earliest being the unknown authorship. It is available from citations from it found in the works of later

1. *Vikramorvaśīya* II. 17.

writers. Haṛsa, who is identified with the king of that name who ruled at Sthānviśvara (606-648 A. D.) and Udbhaṭa (C. 800 A. D.) wrote commentaries on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Mātrgupta, Śankuka (840 A. D.), Bhaṭṭanāyaka (900 A. D.) and Abhinavagupta are other commentators and with the exception of the commentary by the last mentioned writer, the works of other writers are lost.

The *Agnipurāṇa* contains an account of the topics on poetics. The opinion of the scholars is that this portion of the *Purāṇa* must have been composed late after the beginning of the Christian era. Medhāvin and Rudra are cited as early authorities who must have lived after the beginning of the Christian era.

The earliest authoritative work after the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the *Kāvyaadarśa* of Daṇḍin. Indian tradition recognises Daṇḍin as the author of the *Kāvyaadarśa* and the *Daśakumāracarita*. Nothing is clear about his identity or date. Whether he is identical with Daṇḍin, the author of the *Avantisundarikathā*, it is not clear. If he were identical, his date is to be in the latter half of the 7th century A. D.¹ The lower-most limit for Daṇḍin is 850 A. D. when the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King A Moghavarṣa Nṛpatuṅga produced a Kannada version of Daṇḍin's *Kavyādarśa*.

Daṇḍin does not mention his predecessors but simply refers to them without naming them. He refers to the *Setubandha* and *Brhatkathā*. His *Kāvyaadarśa* is in three sections called *pariccheda*. In the first section, Daṇḍin discusses the need for a scientific study of language, classifies the compositions according to form and language, laughs at the division of prose works into *katha* and *ākhyāyikā*, a view which was held by his predecessors in the field, and deals at length with the characteristics of the two important styles *Vaidarbhi* and *Gauḍī*. He has leanings to the *Vaidarbhi* style. In the second section, he deals with the figures of speech (*Arthālaṅkāra*) and in the last with the figures of sound (*Śabdālaṅkāra*), *yamaka* in particular. He has made a good contribution to the importance of the figures of speech and style. He did not make a distinction between *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras*. Daṇḍin uses a charming and elegant style and his treatment of the topic is purely original.

Vāmana was a close follower of Daṇḍin's views. He was the court poet under King Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (779-819 A. D.) He quotes from Bhavabhūti. His date is therefore to be fixed about 800 A. D. He is known as the author of the *Kāvyaālankārasūtra*. The work has five chapters, twelve *adhikaraṇas* and 319 *sūtras*. It contains the rules on poetics in the form of *sūtras*, followed by the *vṛtti* an exposition of them by the author himself together

1. See Chapter 17 under Daṇḍin for the date of the *Kāvyaadarśa*.

with examples of his own production and chosen from the works of others. The *sūtra* form of the rules suggests that the *sūtras* were available before Vāmana for *Alankāra*. Vāmana declares that the *rīti* is the soul of the poem. He classified the styles as *Vaidarbhi*, *Gaudī* and *Pāñcālī*. Like Daṇḍin, he deals with the figures of speech and sound. Both Daṇḍin and Vāmana did not take up sentiment and dramaturgy for treatment. The *Riti* school did not have any follower after Vāmana. The topics treated by Daṇḍin and Vāmana were included by the later writers in their own works for treatment.

Bhāmaha was the son of Rakrila gomin. He wrote a work called *Alankāra* on poetics which came to be called *Bhāmahālankāra* after his name. He quotes lines from and mentions Nyāsakāra, Medhāvin, Śakavardhana, *Ratnāharana* Rāmaśarmān's *Acyutottara*, *Alaṅkara-vamśa* and Rājamitra. Nyāsakāra was Jinendrabuddhi (C. 700 A.D.) who wrote the *Nyāsa* a commentary on the *Kāśika* of Vāmana and Jayāditya. It is not clear whether Bhāmaha refers to Jinendrabuddhi or any other early writer. Rāmaśarman is mentioned in the *Avantisundarīkathā* as a poet and friend of Daṇḍin. Evidently Bhāmaha refers to him. Daṇḍin and Rāmaśarman who were contemporaries lived in the latter half of the 7th Century A. D. The other works and the authors mentioned by Bhāmaha could not be identified. A section of the scholarly world has been holding the view that Daṇḍin followed Bhāmaha and referred to his views. It appears however that Daṇḍin did not found any view himself and that he was only stating in his own way what his predecessors held as their views on the topics of poetics. It appears that Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin were familiar with the view of both the schools of which they were the followers. In a branch like that of poetics, there are certain technical terms and expressions which have to be repeated and which, when used in two or more works, do not prove that they have been borrowed by one author from the other. It is therefore preferable to hold that Bhāmaha was a younger contemporary of Daṇḍin and lived between 700 A. D. and before 750 A. D.

The *Bhāmahālankāra* which is written in a rugged style, has six chapters called *paricchedas*. It is similar to the *Kāvyādarśa*, in treatment. Bhāmahas admit the division of prose into *Kathā* and *Ākhyāyika*, favours the *Gauda* style in preference to the *Vaidarbhi*, recognises only three *guṇas* in lieu of the ten recognised by Bharata and Daṇḍin and deals with the defects of poetry. His main contribution to the branch of poetics is his stress on *Vakrokti*. Hyperbolic expression is at the basis of all figures of speech. He ignored the importance given to sentiment. His insistence on the figures of speech enabled him to get recognition at the hands of later

rhetoricians who cited lines from him. He is recognised as the author of a commentary on the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* of Vararuci.

Udbhaṭa, who flourished in the court of King Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (779-819 A. D.), commented on Bhāmaha's *Alankāra* in his *Bhāmah-ālankāravivaraṇa* which is now lost. His other work, which is available, is called *Alankārasārasaṅgraha* also called *Udbhaṭāṭalankāra*. This work appears to be an epitome of his *Bhāmahavivaraṇa* as the title suggests. In six chapters, it deals primarily with the figures of speech. He follows Bhāmaha closely in treatment. According to him, the styles are three viz, *Upanāgarikā* elegant, *Grāmyā* ordinary and *Paruṣā* harsh. He based his classification merely on sound. After Bharata, he is the first writer to lay stress on the value of sentiment. He is the first writer to recognise *śānta* as the ninth sentiment. About 950 A. D. Pratihārendurāja commented on the *Bhāmahalankāra*, did not make any progress over Udbhaṭa.

The doctrine of *Dhvani* was expounded about 820 A. D. in one hundred and twenty memorable verses (*Kārikās*). The name of the expounder is not known but '*sahṛdaya*' appears to have been the title conferred on him as it is known from later writers. These '*Kārikās*' were commented by Ānandavardhana (circa 850 A. D.) in his *Dhvanyāloka* which contains the *kārikas*, the *vṛtti* of Ānandavardhana on them and examples from the works of various writers including his own. It contains 129 *Kārikas* distributed under four sections called *udiyotas*. The later writers have got confused as regards the authorship of the *kārikas*. Ānandavardhana is credited with the authorship of some of them. His style is lucid and elucidative. Besides, the *Devīśataka*, he quotes from the *Arjunacaritamahākāvya*, *Viṣamabāṇalilā* and *Harivijaya*, all of them being his works. The last two were written in *Prākṛta*. All these except the first one are lost.

The *Dhvanyāloka* was commented in the *Dhvanyālokalocana* by Abhinavagupta (C. 1000 A. D.). It is believed that he studied under nineteen teachers¹. Indurāja taught him *Dhvani* and Bhaṭṭa Tauta dramaturgy. Besides being an authority on *Dhvani* and dramaturgy, he was a leading Saivite of the *Pratyabhijñā* school. It is said he wrote forty-one works in all on *Dhvani*, dramaturgy and *Saivism*². Besides these, he is believed to have written a number of commentaries on *Saiva Āgamas* and certain *stotras*. On *Dhvani* and dramaturgy he wrote the *Dhvanyālokalocana* a commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*, *Abhinavabhāratī* a commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and *Kāvya-kautukavivaraṇa* a commentary on the *Kāvya-kautuka* a work on

1. Abhinavagupta An Historical and Philosophical Study by K. C. Pandey p. 11.

poetics by Bhaṭṭa Tauta. The last mentioned work of Abhinavagupta is known only from references. It is also stated that Abhinavagupta commented on the *Ghaṭakarpara* called *Ghaṭakarparakulaka-viṛṭti*. The *Dhvanyālokalocana* is also designated as *Sahṛdayālokalocana* or *Kāvyaālokalocana*. The author gives illustrations from his own works and the works of other writers. Abhinavagupta refers to *Candrikā* a commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*. The author's name is not mentioned. His *Abhinavabhāratī* is a valuable commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta are the highest authorities on *Dhvani*. The views of the opponents like Mahimabhaṭṭa, and Kuntaka who refuted vehemently the doctrine of *Dhvani* were respected but who were not able to alter the position of importance of *Dhvani* gained through the works of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. The *Dhvani* school has profoundly influenced the other schools of poetics like those of *Rasa* and *Alaṅkāra* while those of *Rīti* and *Vakrokti* did not continue to hold their position.

During the period when the *Dhvani* school took its rise and developed, there were leading exponents of the *Rasa* doctrine who held their own views notwithstanding the rise of the doctrine of *Dhvani*. They had nothing like a good following but had independent and individual views on *Rasa*. Some among them ignored the influence of the *Dhvani* doctrine while some refuted it. Lollaṭa (700 – 800 A. D.), whose commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is lost, was a champion of the *Rasa* school. Śaṅkuka (circa 840 A. D.) a contemporary of Ānandavardhana wrote a commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* which is now lost. His poem *Bhuvanābhyudaya* also is lost. He criticised the view of the direct experience of sentiment as held by Lollaṭa and expressed inference as the only means of feeling the rise of sentiment. Bhaṭṭanāyaka (circa 900 A. D.) wrote the *Hṛdayadarpaṇa* which is considered to have been a commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. The work is not now available. He held sentiment as the soul of poetry. Sentiment could be presented to the reader of poems and to the spectators of dramatic performances. Kuntaka also known as Kuntala (c. 1000 A. D.) wrote the *Vakroktijivita* which is now found incomplete in three chapters. He was a younger contemporary of Abhinavagupta. He refuted the *Dhvani* doctrine and maintained that *vakrokti* constituted the life of poetry. Both sentiment and suggestion are subordinated to the figures of speech which are grouped as *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*. The beauty of a poem or a drama lies in the figure of speech *vakrokti* and not in sentiment or suggestion. Bhaṭṭa Tauta, who lived in the second half of the 10th century A. D., wrote the *Kāvyakautuka* which is now lost. His view was that sentiment is experienced alike by the hero, the author and the hearer and that *santa* was at that the head of all sentiments. Mahimabhaṭṭa (circa 1050 A. D.), attacked the doctrine of *Dhvani* following the lead of Śaṅ-

kuka and held that sentiment could be experienced through inference. He attacks the views held by Abhinavagupta and Kuntaka. He wrote the *Vyaktiviveka* in three sections in which he expressed his views. It shows the author as an erudite scholar and critic noted for logical accuracy and deep insight. His other work *Tattvoktikośa* on poetics is now lost.

During this period, some writers in this field did not take part in this controversy but made their contributions to poetics. Their views were however influenced by the *Rasa* and *Dhavanī* schools. Rudraṭa, (800—850 A. D.) was the first to attempt to classify the figures of speech on a scientific basis. He wrote the *Kāvyāṭlankāra* in sixteen chapters. He treats elaborately, the figures of sense and sound, *vakrokti* and *yamaka* and the styles of Vāmana and Daṇḍin by adding the *Lāṭi* as the fourth. He discusses the theory of sentiment. He was also called Śatānanda. Rājaśekhara (900 A. D.) wrote the *Kāvyamimāṃsa* in eighteen chapters. He does not deal with the exposition of the topics of poetics. His work is a practical handbook for poets. It contains interesting information about the poets, the languages and is a mine of information about everything connected with poets. He mentions some poetesses. Rudrabhaṭṭa's *Sṛṅgāratilaka* treats only with sentiment. He recognises *sānta* as the ninth sentiment. His *Rasakalikā* on the same topic is unpublished. His date is not known definitely but he must have lived before 1000 A. D. Some scholars maintain the identity between him and Rudraṭa.

Under King Muñja of Dhārā, Dhanañjaya, (c 900 A. D.) son of Viṣṇu, wrote the *Daśarūpa* in four *prakāśas* which deal with dramaturgy. Sentiment also receives treatment. He follows closely the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. The work contains three hundred memorable lines (*kārikas*) on dramaturgy. Dhanika, the son of Viṣṇu, was probably his brother, who wrote the *Avaloka* the commentary on the *Daśarūpa*. He wrote it after Muñja's death. The date of this commentary may be placed in 1000 A. D. The *Daśarūpa* with *Avaloka* became very famous soon after they were composed and has continued since then the standard treatise on dramaturgy. Dhanika's *Kāvyanirṇaya* a work on poetics, which is referred to in the *Avaloka*, is now lost.

Bhoja, who ruled at Dhārā between 1005—1054 A. D., was himself an accomplished man of letters and was also a patron of poets. He distinguished himself in many branches of study by composing works representing them. In the field of poetics, he is credited with the authorship of two works *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* and *Sṛṅgāraprakāśā*. The *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* is a voluminous work in five chapters. It discusses the merits and defects of poetry, figures of speech and sentiments. *Āvanti* and *Māgadhi* are added as the two additional styles to the fourth one added by Rudraṭa. He quotes

profusely from various writers. His work is therefore valuable for settling the chronology of the poets. The *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* has thirty-six chapters. Having treated in the first twelve chapters the features of *Mahākāvya*, drama and the qualities and defects of poetry, the author devotes the remaining twenty-four chapters to the treatment of sentiments of which the love sentiment is given prominence.

Kṣemendra (1050 A. D.), who was the pupil of Abhinavagupta, wrote the *Aucityavicāracarcā* and *Kavikanṭhābharaṇa*. In the former work, the author maintains that appropriateness (*aucitya*) contributes to the elegance of sentiment. The very life of sentiment depends upon appropriateness of words, their meaning, qualities, figures of speech, sentiment and all the factors which constitute the poem. The author gives illustrations from his own works and from the works of other writers. In his treatment of this topic he is greatly influenced by the views of the *Dhvani* school. He does not hesitate to point out the defect, if any, in the composition of a poet however eminent he had been nor does he appear to be a favourite of any poet. His *Kavikanṭhābharaṇa* in five chapters gives useful information for one to become a poet, to maintain the position which one has acquired and other details regarding poets and their ways. Many poets and their works quoted by him in those works remain at present only in their names. His own works were many which are found quoted in this work but most of them are lost.

The doctrine of *Dhvani* received fresh treatment after silencing the critics by Mammaṭa who lived about 1100 A. D. Along with Allata, also known as Alaka, he wrote the *Kāvyaprakāśa* which contains ten chapters called *ullāsas*. This work deals with all the topics of the field except dramaturgy. It is held that Mammaṭa wrote up to *Parikara* a figure of speech in the ninth chapter and the remaining part of the work was written by Allata. It contains memorable verses, *kīrtikas*, which are commented by Mammata with suitable illustrations. Some of these verses appear to have been taken from the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. The *Kāvyaprakāśa* has become very popular soon after it was written and has since then become the most authoritative text on poetics. The popularity of the work is attested by the existence of seventy commentaries on it. Mammaṭa wrote another work called *Sabdavyāpāravicāra* on the denotation of words.

Hemacandra's (1088 – 1172 A. D.) *Kāvyānuśāsana* with his own commentary *Alankāracūdāmaṇi* on it has eight chapters. It covers the entire field of poetics and dramaturgy. Ruyyaka, also known as Rucaka, wrote about 1150 A. D. the *Alankārasarvasva* which is in the form of *sūtras* with a commentary on them. The opinion of the critics is divided regarding the authorship of the commentary which is called *vṛtti*. One view is that the *sūtras* were composed by Ruyyaka

and the *vṛtti* by Mankha, pupil of Ruyyaka. The other view is that Ruyyaka wrote both the *sūtras* with the *vṛtti*. In this work, Ruyyaka adopts a scientific mode of exposition and examination for the figures of speech. Ruyyaka wrote besides this work, a commentary on the *Kāvya-prakāśa*, a commentary on the *Vyaktiriveka* of Mahimabhaṭṭa, *Sahityamimāmsā*, *Nāṭakamimāmsā*, *Harṣacaritarārtika* a commentary on the *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa, *Alankārānusārini* and *Sahṛdayalilā*. Except the *Harṣacaritarārtika*, all the works deal with poetics. The *Sahṛdayalilā* gives an account of the mode of life which a man of taste is expected to lead.

Vāgbhaṭa, a Jain, son of Soma, is the author of a work on *Alankāra* called *Vāgbhaṭāṭalankāra* after his name. In five chapters, he treats the poem, its forms, languages, *guṇas*, figures of speech, sentiments and conventions of poets. The *Candrāloka* is the work of Jayadeva, the logician, dramatist and rhetorician who lived about 1250 A. D. It deals with all the topics of rhetorics except dramaturgy in a lucid and attractive way. Śāradātanaya (circa 1250 A. D.) wrote the *Bhāvaprakāśana* in ten chapters. He treats the subject of poetics following closely Bharata and notices the views divergent from Bharata's. He recognises sentiment as the soul of poetry. He denies a place for *śānta* among sentiments. He develops the sentiment of love on the lines of Bhoja. Vāgbhaṭa, son of Nemikumaṛa, was also a Jain different from Vāgbhaṭa the author of the *Vāgbhaṭāṭalankāra*. He lived about the end of the 13th century A. D. His work is the *Kāvyaānuśāsana* in five chapters written in the form of *sūtras* with his own commentary *Alankāratilaka* on them. In contents, it is similar to the *Vāgbhaṭāṭalankāra*. About the same period was written the *Alankāra-samgraha* on all the topics of rhetorics by Amṛtānandayogin.

Singabhūpala a Reddi prince, who lived about 1400 A. D., was himself a man of letters and a patron of poets. His *Rāsarṇavasudhā-kara*, which is in three chapters, treats sentiment and dramaturgy. Some scholars believe it to be the work of Viśveśvara patronised by Singabhūpala. Bhānudatta, who lived about 1400 A. D., wrote the *Rasamanjari* and *Rasatarangiṇi* both dealing with sentiments, that of love in particular. Viśvanātha who lived in the first half of the 14th century was an inhabitant of Orissa. He is the author of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* in ten chapters covering the entire field of poetics and dramaturgy. Besides quoting from the works of other writers, he quotes from his own works *Raghuvilāsamahākavya*, *Kuvalayāśvacaritra* a *Prākṛta* poem, *Prabhāvatī* a *Nāṭikā*, *Candrakalānāṭikā* and *Narasimhaviṇaya* a poem, all of which are now lost. Vemabhūpala (circa 1420 A. D.) the Reddi prince is credited with the authorship of the *Sāhityacintāmaṇi* in thirteen chapters dealing with the figures of sound and sense. The author was a ruler of the

Koṇḍavīḍu dynasty and in his court flourished Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa. In 1533 A. D., Rūpagosvamin wrote the *Ujjvalanilamani* containing illustrations in praise of Kṛṣṇa. It was commented by Jīvagosvāmin. Appayadīkṣita, who was born in 1554 A. D., wrote the *Kuvalayānanda*, *Citramimāṃsā* and *Vṛttivārtika*. Taking the fifth chapter of Jayadeva's *Candrāloka*, he introduced certain changes in it which he considered necessary and commented on it in his *Kuvalayānanda*. This work, since it is based on the 5th chapter of the *Candrāloka*, deals with the figures of sense (*Arthālankaras*). The work is very popular in South India. The *Citramimāṃsā* contains a scientific treatment of the figures of speech. The work is incomplete. The *Vṛttivārtika* deals with the denotation of words. Keśavamisra composed in the latter half of the 16th century the *Alankāraśekhara*, which deals mainly with the figures of speech classified into groups. He gives some useful information by way of advice to the poets. Jagannātha (1590—1665) is the author of the *Rasagangādhara* and *Citramimānisākhaṇḍana*. The *Rasagangādhara* is a standard work on figures of speech. He defines the figure of speech, discusses them by giving his own illustrations and refers to the views of his predecessors. He is independent in his views and is bold in criticising even the famous writers from whom he differs. He vehemently opposes the doctrine of *Dhvani* and maintains the theory of sentiment. His *Citramimānisākhaṇḍana* is an adverse criticism of Appayadīkṣita's *Citramimāṃsā*. Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita (c. 1600 A. D.) is the author of the *Kāvyaadarpaṇa* with his own commentary *Alankāracūḍāmaṇi* on it. The *Alankāraakaustubha* and *Alankārakarṇābharaṇa* are the two works on figures of speech by Viśveśvara who lived at the beginning of the 18th century A. D.

Certain compositions on poetics were written in praise of their patrons by the authors of those compositions. The illustrations are generally composed by the authors in praise of their patrons. To this type belongs the *Ekāvali* of Vidyādhara (circa 1300 A. D.) who wrote it in praise of his patron Narasimha King of Utkala and Kalinga. It is written on the model of the *Kāvyaaprakāśa*. The peculiar feature of the type of this composition appears clear from the title of the *Pratāparudriyayaśobhūṣaṇa* written by Vidyānātha, who is identified with Agastya. It is in praise of Pratāparudradeva of Warangal (circa 1300 A. D.). The *Camatkāracandrikā* of Viśveśvara is in praise of Singabhūpāla (circa 1400 A. D.). Yajñanārāyaṇa wrote the *Alankāraratnākara* in praise of Raghunātha Naik of Tanjore (1614—1632 A. D.). The *Nanjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* by Nṛsimha kavi, who had the title Abhinavakalidāsa, was written in praise of Nanjarāja (latter half of the 18th century). Sadāśivamakhin wrote the *Rāmavarma-yasobhūṣaṇa* in praise of Rāmavarman King of Travancore towards the end of the 18th century.

Some of these rhetoricians discuss the aim and purpose of writing

poetry. Wealth and fame are considered to be the aims. The four-fold ends of human existence are suggested by some writers. The manifold purpose is brought out by Mammaṭa in the lines :—

काव्यं यशसेऽर्थकृते व्यवहारविदे शिवेतरक्षतये ।

सद्यः परनिर्वृतये कान्तासंमिततयोद्देशयुजे ॥

Kāvya prakāśa I

It is mentioned that Kālidāsa got fame by writing poetry, Bāṇa wealth, and Mayūra cure from disease.

Three causes are mentioned in getting success in the art of composing poems viz., inspiration, flawless learning and application.² In the absence of inspiration, one can succeed as a poet with the help of the two other means. Hemacandra recommends a novice to take three quarters of a stanza which is already available and compose the fourth quarter. In his *Kavikarṇābharaṇa*, Kṣemendra discusses the extent to which one may rise in the field of poetry and in his *Aucityavicāracarcā* discusses the place of propriety as indispensable for the perfection of sentiment. The advices given by these writers, are of course, wholesome but have resulted in the repetition of ideas and phrases of earlier poets.

The poets had to prove their worth in the gathering of scholars. Rājasekhara tells in his *Kāvyamimāṃsā* that Kalidāsa, Haricandra and others were examined in Ujjain and that Upavarṣa, Pāṇini, Vararuci, Patañjali and others in Pāṭalīpūtra.² Sometimes a poet's ability was tested by asking him to compose a stanza off-hand on a given topic, to complete the stanza left unfinished by some other writer, and to solve the riddles. The accounts of such incidents are given in the *Bhojaprabandha* of Ballālasena, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga and *Srikanthacarita* of Mankha. Dharmadāsa, a Buddhist ascetic, who lived in the beginning of the 13th century, wrote the *Vidagdhamukhamandana* in four parts dealing with riddles. Therefore a poet, who sought admission in the court of a king, was expected to be familiar with a wide range of subjects so as to please the gathering composed of men of diverse tastes. The *Kāmasūtra* gives useful advice as to how a poet could equip himself.

1. Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* I. 103.

2, *Kāvyamimāṃsā* of Rājasekhara Chapter X.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES AND GRAMMAR

The term ' *sāstra* ' is used to denote the branch of study which is treated on a scientific basis. The word means ' that by which something is taught '. It was originally applied to those subjects of study which were closely connected with the Vedic religion. Later on, all other subjects, which were dealt with on a similar basis, came to be called ' *śāstras* '. The origin of a branch denoted by the ' *śāstra* ' must have been due to the difficulty felt in treating all the topics of discussion included under the same head of the Vedic religion. In due course, each branch acquired an importance of its own and thus arose the specialisation of a branch of study which, however, included the understanding of the general principles of the various branches of study. Thus there arose branches like those of the *Vaiyākaraṇas*, *Nairuktas*, *Yājñikas* and others.

THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE ŚĀSTRAS

The fundamental principles of a *śāstra* are generally found recorded in the form of aphorisms (*sūtras*), brief and enigmatic. This form was adopted mainly with a view to minimise the burden on the memory of the pupils. These aphorisms are understandable only with the help of the expositions offered by the preceptors who were the sole authorities to interpret them. The rise of the various branches and the views maintained in them sometimes antagonistic to each other made the pupils put questions to the preceptors on certain knotty points to which the preceptors gave their answers. All these were embodied in the form of expositions of the aphorisms which came to be called ' *bhāṣyas* '. Critical remarks were also offered by the teachers and these were embodied in ' *vārtikas* ' and ' *vṛttis* '. The growing material in each branch of study were, for the sake of clearness of the main doctrines in them, put together in the form of memorable verses (*karikas*) which were commented generally by the authors themselves. From time to time, discussions were held on the principles of the various branches in the courts of kings and in the assemblies of the learned. The nature of the conduct of the debates was in a great degree responsible for the scholastic and dialectic type of this literature. Generally the discussions of the topics

are found written in prose. Those written in the later period are teeming with long compounds. Verses are used for drawing a conclusion or to lay stress on any point of dispute. Verbs are hardly used in the scientific literatures of the later period. All the branches of the *śāstras*, with the exception of the heterodox (*nāstika*) systems, trace their origin to the Vedas.

The four *Vedas*, with their six supplements, *Purāṇas*, *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṃsā* and *Dharmśāstra* form into fourteen branches¹. The *Āyurveda*, *Dhanurveda*, *Gāndhārvaveda* and *Arthaśāstra* are the secondary *Vedas* (*upavedas*) and are four branches. There are thus eighteen branches of sciences.

GRAMMAR

Among the supplements of the *Vedas*, the science of Grammar occupies an important position. While grammar is treated as forming part of the literature in other languages, it is an independent branch in the *Saṃskṛta* language. Its origin is to be traced to the Vedic period where its development was greatly influenced by the *Nirukta* and *Sikṣā*, the two Vedic supplements.

Many were the grammarians who attempted to regulate the use of words during the post-Vedic period by writing grammatical treatises. Their works are now lost except for that of Pāṇini. He was born at Śālātura near Attock. He was the son Dākṣī. His date is fixed between 700 and 600 B. C. According to the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, he was a pupil of Varṣa, his co-pupils being Kātyāyana, Vyādi and Indradatta. He was not satisfied with the education he received under Varṣa, and therefore propitiated Śiva who taught him the fourteen comprehensive (*pratyāhāra*) *sūtras* which were developed by Pāṇini. Pāṇini had many predecessors in the field whose results were available to him. He invented some new technical terms, rules of interpretations, suffixes and others. He composed the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in eight chapters containing about 4000 aphorisms. By using algebraic symbols, elliptical statements (*pratyāharas*) and by omitting words which could be conveniently supplied from the previous aphorisms, Pāṇini has achieved brevity. He analyses forms with great acumen. His *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is 'a monument at once of encyclopaedic research and technical perfection'. Pāṇini wrote also the *Dhātupatha* a list of roots, *Gaṇapāṭha* a list of words and *Unādi sūtras*. It is held by some scholars that the *Unadisūtras* of Pāṇini were revised by Kātyāyana while others attribute them to the authorship of Kātyāyana himself.

1. पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।

वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥

Yajñavalkya Smṛti I. 3.

Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* was criticised and expounded by many writers but their works are now lost. Vyāḍi is said to have written in one lakh of verses a work called *Sangraha* a comment on Pāṇini's system. Patañjali quotes from this work which is now lost. Kātyāyana, who lived between 500 and 350 B. C. wrote the *Vartika* in metrical and prose form on Pāṇini's work. He attempts to correct, modify and supplement the work of Pāṇini. He offers his own solutions in some cases and in some others, he removes the aphorisms. He is said to have written the *Vajasaneyī pratiśakhya*, and the *Srauta-sūtras*. He is identified with Vararuci who wrote the *Liṅganuśusana*, *Vararucisangraha* in twenty-five memorable lines on case construction, compounds, verbs and nominal formation, a lexicon, *Puṣpasūtras* and a poem called *Vararucilavya*.

The next grammarian, whose work is available, is Patañjali who lived about 150 B. C. and wrote the *Mahabhaṣya*. It is based on the *Sangraha* of Vyāḍi. He offers his own desiderata (*iṣṭi*) on Pāṇini's *sūtras*. Very often he defends Pāṇini from the attack of Kātyāyana. He mentions some of his predecessors in the field of grammar. His style is lively and simple in his *Mahabhaṣya* which is unparalleled, by its style, in the whole range of *Samskṛta* literature. Patañjali, who was an incarnation of Ādiśeṣa, was born at Gonarda. He is said to have written works on *Yoga* and medicine.

After the days of Patañjali, no original work of importance was produced till the 15th century A.D. The *Mahābhāṣya* appears to have been studied during this period. Bhartṛhari who lived in the 5th century A. D.¹ and whose name as a grammarian was well known during the visit of I-tsing (672—675 A. D.) commented on the *Mahābhāṣya* in his *Mahābhāṣyadipikā* which is now incomplete. He also wrote another work called *Vākyapadiya* in three chapters dealing with the philosophical status of grammar. He maintains the doctrine of *sphoṭa* and the monism of the *Advaita* through sound.

Jayāditya and Vāmaṇa composed the *Kāśikā* a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. I-tsing (672—675 A. D.) speaks about the popularity of the work during the time of his visit. The Chinese, during this period, studied this work for learning *Samskṛta*. The work must have been composed about 600 A. D. It is held that the commentary on the first five *adhyayas* was composed by Jayāditya and that on the remaining portion by Vāmaṇa. This was commented by Jinendrabuddhi also known as Pūjyapāda Devanandin, a Jain in his *Kāśikavivaranaṇapañjikā* which is familiarly known as the *Nyāsa*. Jinendrabuddhi lived in the latter half of the 7th century A. D. The *Kāśika* with *Nyāsa* contains references to some writers and their works and

1. I-tsing and Bhartṛhari's *Vakyapadiya* by Prof. C. Kunhan Raja in Dr. Krishnaswamy Iyengar Commemoration Volume.

therefore is very helpful in fixing the chronology of the *Samskr̥ta* literature. The *Kaṣika* was commented in the 11th century A. D. by Haradatta in his *Padamañjari*.

Bhoja, (1005-1054 A. D.), King of Dhārā, composed the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* on the model of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. It contains eight *adhyāyas* and more than 6000 aphorisms. The intention of the author appears to have been an attempt to make the study of grammar easier through this work.

In the same century, the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali was commented by Kaiyaṭa of the 11th century A. D., son of Jaiyaṭa in his *Pradipa* which was commented by Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, in the later part of the 17th century A. D. in his *Udyota* and by Annambhaṭṭa C 1700 A. D., in his *Udyotana*.

Dharmakīrti, a Buddhist monk of Ceylon wrote the *Rupāratāra* in which he dealt with the *sūtras* of Pāṇini in a different order so as to make them be of help for the beginners who study the *Samskr̥ta* grammar. The author lived in the latter part of the 12th century A. D. The *Durghataṭvṛtti* is the work of Saraṇadeva a Buddhist who composed it in 1173 A. D. In this work, the words, which are held to be incorrect in the light of the rules of grammar and which are used by eminent poets, are justified to be correct. The *Rūpamālā*, dealing with the forms used in the language, was written in the 14th century A. D. by Vimalasarasvatī.

Rāmacandra (circa 1450 A. D.) wrote the *Prakriyākaumudī* wherein are found the *sūtras* of Pāṇini rearranged for the benefit of the beginners. The *Prakriyasarvasva* was written by Narayanaḥṭṭa, (1600 A. D.) the author of the *Narayaṇīya*. The author recasts the *sūtras* of Pāṇini and explains them in this work in a manner useful for the understanding of the formation of words. Appayadīkṣita (circa 1600 A. D.) wrote the *Paṇinivādanakṣatramālā* on the controversial topics of grammar.

Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita was the greatest of the grammarians in the 17th century. It is said that he became a pupil of Appayadīkṣita and studied *Vedānta* under him. Great was the contribution made to the system of grammar by Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, the members of his family and his pupils. About 1630 A. D., he wrote the *Siddhāntakaumudī* on the model of the *Prakriyākaumudī* of Rāmacandra whose influence is felt in his work. The results achieved by the writing of this work have been of far reaching effect and this work, since it was written, has outshone all the earlier works including the *Kaṣika*. It has become a standard text on grammar for the beginners. Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita wrote on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, his own commentary called the *Praudhamanorama*. He also wrote the *Sabdakaustubha* a commentary on Pāṇini's *sūtras* in the order of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* the *Linganaśanavṛtti* a commentary on the *Linganaśasana*, a

work on the genders of nouns by Pāṇini and the *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana* a metrical work summarising the philosophical doctrines of the grammarians are attributed to the authorship of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita.

Varadarāja (c. 1650 A. D.), a pupil of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, wrote the *Madhyasiddhantakaumudī* and *Laghusiddhantakaumudī* which represent the abridged forms of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. During the same period, Koṇḍabhaṭṭa, nephew of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, wrote the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* which is a commentary on the *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjanam* of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita.

Nāgeśabhaṭṭa was the pupil of Haridīkṣita grandson of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita. He is assigned to the end of the 17th century A. D. His works are many in the field of grammar, *Yoga*, *Dharmaśāstra* and *Alankāra*. He commented on the *Rasagangādhara* of Jagannātha. He wrote the *Brhacchabdendusekhara* and *Laghuśabdendusekhara* which are respectively bigger and smaller commentaries on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. The *Mahābhāṣyapradīpodyota* was written by him as the commentary on the *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa. On the philosophical aspects of the grammar of the *Saṁskṛta* language, he wrote three works *Manjūṣā*, *Laghumanjūṣā* and *Paramalaghumanjūṣā* varying in extent. His *Sphoṭavāda* deals with the doctrine of *sphoṭa* of the grammarians. His *Paribhāṣendusekhara* gives a lucid exposition of the canons of interpretation (*paribhāṣas*) which are recognised in the system of grammar. Pāyaguṇḍa Vaidyanātha (c. 1750 A. D.), the pupil of Nāgeśa, wrote a number of works on grammar most of them being the commentaries on the works of his immediate predecessors. The study of the *Siddhāntakaumudī* was made easier by the writing of the scholarly and critical commentary *Tattvabodhini* by Jñānendrasarasvatī (c. 1750 A. D.) and of the exhaustive and simple commentary *Bālaṁanoramā* on it by Vāsudeva-dīkṣita (c. 1750 A. D.).

Sāyaṇa, the brother of Mādhava (c. 1350 A. D.) of Vijayanagar, wrote the *Dhaturṛtti* and chose to call it after his brother's name as *Mādhavīyadhaturṛtti*. It gives the forms of the roots in the various tenses together with their derivatives.

The study of the system of grammar was fully developed with the help of the *Lingānuśāsanas* which are attributed to the authorship of Pāṇini, Vararuci, Śabarāsvāmin, Harṣavardhana and others, the *Uṇādisūtras* which contain rules for deriving all the words from roots, the *Phitsūtras* which deal with the rules of accents, the *Gaṇapāṭhas* which are lists of words that come under the same rules, and a list of words. Pāṇini is said to be the author of many of these. The *Phitsūtras* are ascribed to the authorship of Śāntanavācārya and also to Śāntanu by some scholars.

The doctrine of sphoṭa.

With a view to raise the system of grammar from the status of being a science to the rank of a system of thought, the grammarians have formulated a doctrine called the doctrine of *sphoṭa* which can be summed up thus :—The letters in a word cannot convey any sense by themselves or when grouped together, for as soon as the letters are uttered, they disappear and by the time the last letter is uttered, the previous letters do not exist. Therefore letters do not convey anything by themselves. Something other than the letters is to be admitted as necessary to indicate the meaning. What is thus admitted is the *sphoṭa* which reveals the meaning. The very term '*sphoṭa*' means that which makes clear what is otherwise not made clear. *Sphoṭa* therefore reveals the meaning which is not expressed by the letters. *Sphoṭa* is only one, all-pervasive and eternal. *Vaikhari*, *Madhyamā*, *Paśyantī* and *Parā* are the four main stages of *sphoṭa* recognised when the letters are uttered.

Patañjali refers to this doctrine. According to Nāgeśa, Sage Sphoṭāyana was the founder of the doctrine. Bhartṛhari is the earliest writer to give a full treatment to this doctrine in his *Vākyapadīya*. There is identity between the transient nature of the words uttered and the Brahman which appears illusory in the form of the words. The utterance of a word is the manifestation of consciousness which is designated by the term '*sphoṭa*'. The words are not mere sounds. They have real form which is subtle and far beyond the range of perception. The use for correct words amounts to doing *dharma*. *Sphoṭa* is identical with the Brahman. Because of this doctrine, the grammarians are treated as the worshippers of the Śabda Brahman of which the musicians have been the votaries. The *sphoṭa siddhi* of Maṇḍana Miśra (615-695 A. D.) deals with the doctrine of *sphoṭa*. Nāgeśabhaṭṭa systematised this doctrine in his *sphoṭavāda*.

The Schools of Grammar other than Pāṇini's.

Long after Pāṇini wrote his *Aṣṭādhyayi*, a need was felt to simplify the voluminous work of Pāṇini to meet the popular demand. The adherents of the Buddhist, Jain and other faiths desired to evolve out of Pāṇini's system a system to suit their own needs. Thus there arose a number of schools most of them opposed to the Vedic religion which have therefore dropped the Vedic section from their texts and have their own *Dhātupāṭha*, *Gaapāṭha*, *Uṇadisutras* and *Linganuśāsana*. Response from a section of the people, and their out-spoken anti-Pāṇinīyan outlook made them short-lived. They flourished under the support of the followers of the particular religions for a short period. Most of them have now entirely disappeared or have little followers.

The *Candra* school was founded by a Buddhist Candragomin who wrote the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* in six chapters containing 3100 *sūtras*. He must have lived before 500 A. D., since his

influence is felt on the *Kāśikā*. This work and about ten others of this school have all been translated into Tibetan. This school became popular in Ceylon where it was recast in the 13th century A. D. by a Buddhist priest named Kāśyapa who wrote the *Bālāva-bodha*.

The *Jainendra* school traces its origin to the Jina Mahāvīra who it is believed answered certain questions put to him by Indra. These answers formed the beginning for the rise of a new school of grammar which owes its name both to Jina and Indra who were responsible for the rise of the system. The original text has come down in two versions one of 700 *sūtras* and the other of 300 *sūtras*. They are more difficult than Pāṇini's because of their technical terms which are more difficult than in Pāṇini's *sūtras*. Devanandin, who had the title Pūjyapāda, and identified with Jinendrabuddhi, is said to have been the founder of the *sūtras*. Except for two commentaries on them one by Abhayānandin (750 A. D.) and the other by Somadeva (11th century A. D.), there is no other work to represent this system. The *Pancavastu* of recent date and of unknown authorship is a recast of the original text. This school was popular with the *Digambara* Jains.

The *Śākaṭāyana* school was founded by the Śvetāmbara Jain Śākaṭāyana in the 9th century A. D. Śākaṭāyana wrote the *Śabdānu-śāsana* with his own commentary on it called *Amoghavṛtti*. This work is on the model of the grammars of the *Cāndra*, *Jainendra* and Pāṇini. In four chapters it contains 3200 *sūtras*. In arrangement, it resembles the *Siddhānta'aumudī*. The system was recast in the 11th century by Dayāpāla who wrote the *Rupasiddhi* and in the 14th century by Abhayacandra who wrote the *Prakriyasangraha*.

The founder of the *Hemacandra* school was the Jain Hemacandra (1088--1172 A. D.). His *Sabdanuśāsana* has 4500 *sūtras* in eight chapters, the last chapter being devoted to the *Prākṛta* grammar. The author wrote on this work, the *Brhad-vṛtti* his commentary. His *Sabdanuśāsana* was commented by Meghavijaya (17th century) who wrote the *Sabdacandrika*. His *Brhad-vṛtti* was commented by Devendrasūri of uncertain date in his *Haimalaghunyāsa*.

The *Kātantra* school took its rise as a sequel to the school of Pāṇini. Śaravarman, also known as Śarvavarman, who was an opponent of Guṇāḍhya, avowed to teach King Śātavāhana the *Saṁskṛta* language in six months. He propitiated Subrahmanya who revealed to him, a simpler system of grammar called *Kātantra*, *Kalāpa* or *Kaumāra*. The date of this text is to be placed in the 1st century A.D. or B.C. Being comparatively shorter than the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* has four books containing 1400 *sūtras* which are made clear by the dropping of the elliptical statements (*pratyāharas*) and arranged as in the later *Kaumudis*. This was commented in the 8th century A. D. by Durgasiṁha. It became

popular in Kashmir and Ceylon. In Kashmir, Bhaṭṭa Jayaddhara wrote the *Bālabodhini* on this system. It was commented in the *Nyāsa* by Ugrabhūti.

The *Sārasvata* school took its rise to meet the demand of the Muslim rulers. Brevity, simplicity of treatment, and absence of the difficult and out of the way forms characterise this grammar which has only seven hundred *sūtras*. The title ' *Sārasvata* ' for this school is because of the basic *sūtras* which were revealed by Goddess Sarasvatī. This school rose up about 1250 A. D. One Narendra is said to have written the *sūtras*. Anubhūtiśvarupācārya is said to have arranged them and written a commentary on them called *Sārasvata-prakriya*. He lived in the second half of the 13th century A. D. As many as fifteen commentaries were written on this *Sārasvata-prakriya*. This system was popular till the time of Bhaṭṭojī-dīkṣita.

The *Bopadeva* school has for its text the *Mugdhabodha* of Bopadeva who lived in the 13th century A. D. This school aimed at simplifying the grammar of Pāṇini. Simplicity of treatment, brevity and the religious element are the marked features of this system. The technical terms used here are hard to understand and they have made the grammar difficult. The *Mugdhabodha* was commented by Rāmatarkavāgīśa. Bopadeva is also the author of the *Kavikalpa-druma* containing a list of roots arranged according to their endings and of the *Kāmadhenu*, his own commentary on it.

The *Jaumara* school was founded by Kramadīśvara who wrote the *Sankṣiptasāra* an abridged version of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The author is placed after the 11th century A. D., but before the 14th century A. D. Jūmaranandin revised it and therefore the system was called after his name. Jūmaranandin wrote the *Rasavati* a commentary on the *Sankṣiptasāra*. The *Goyīcandrikā*, a commentary on the *Sankṣiptasāra*, is ascribed to Goyīcandra.

The *Saupadma* school was founded by Padmanābhabhaṭṭa who, in the 14th century A. D., remodelled the greater part of Pāṇini's grammar, by writing his *Saupadmavyākaraṇa* with his own commentary on it called *Supadmapanjikā*.

The *Harināmāmṛta* by Rūpagosvamin a pupil of Caitanya shows the author's attempt to present grammar in a sectarian spirit. Of similar nature is the *Harināmāmṛta* of Jivagosvāmin and the *Caitanyāmṛta* of unknown authorship. Contrasted from these works which glorify Kṛṣṇa is the *Prabodhacandrikā* wherein Śiva is praised by Bālarāmapāñcānana.

Along with the *Saṁskṛta* grammar, the *Prākṛta* grammar also had its own development. The earliest work is the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* by Vararuci. It deals with the Mahārāṣṭrī *Prākṛta* in the first nine chapters and in the succeeding three with the *Paiśācī*, *Māgādhī* and

Śaurasenī respectively. It does not treat with *Apabhramśa*. The date of the author must therefore be before 500 A D. when *Apabhramśa* grew up into a dialect. The Indian tradition identifies Vararuci with Kātyāyana the grammarian of the pre-Christian era. Bhāmaha the famous rhetorician (circa 700 A. D) commented on all the chapters of the work except the last by writing the *Manoramā*. In the 10th century, Rāmapāṇivāda commented on the first nine chapters in his *Prākṛtaprakāśavṛtti*. Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka (circa 1150 A D) wrote the *Sricih-na'avya* in which he gives illustrations for the rules contained in the *Prākṛt prakāśa* of Vararuci.

The *Prākṛtasūtras* are attributed to the authorship of Vālmīki, the author of the *Ramayana*. They are also called *Vālmikisūtras*. They could not be of early origin since they, in the form in which they are available, deal with the *Mahārāṣṭrī*, *Śaurasenī*, *Māgadhī*, *Paiśācī*, *Cūlikā* and *Apabhramśa*. Trivikrama of the 14th century, who commented on these *sūtras* in his *Prākṛtasūtravṛtti* was perhaps the author of them. Hemacandra composed the *Prākṛtasūtras* which he included in the eighth chapter of his *Sabdanuśasana*. He himself wrote a commentary on them. He treats with the *Prākṛta* language, *Jain Mahārāṣṭrī* and *Ārṣa Prākṛta*.

Trivikrama, in the 14th century, wrote, besides his commentary on the *Prākṛtasūtras*, the *Prākṛta Sabdanuśasana*. Simharāja of the same century wrote the *Prākṛtarupavatara*. The *Saṁbaṣacandrika*, which was composed by Lakṣmīdhara towards the close of the 16th century, deals with the six dialects of the *Prākṛta* language viz., *Mahārāṣṭrī*, *Māgadhī*, *Śaurasenī*, *Paiśācī*, *Cūlikāpaiśācī* and *Apabhramśa*. The *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa* is by one Candra of unknown date. One Laṅkeśvara, also known as Rāvaṇa, wrote the *Prākṛtakāmadhenu* a commentary on the *Prākṛtavya'arāṇasūtra* of Śeṣanāga. The *Prākṛtakāmadhenu* influenced the writing of the *Prākṛtakalpataru* by Rāmatarkavāgīśa in the 17th century which in turn influenced Mārkaṇḍeya of the same century to write the *Prākṛtasarvasva*.

CHAPTER XXVII.

PROSODY AND LEXICOGRAPHY.

PROSODY.

The *Sankhyāyanasrautasutra*, *Nidānasutra*, *Rkpratisākhya*, *Anukramanīs* of Kātyāyana and others deal with the metres of the Vedic texts. Prosody has a continued development in the classical period. During this period, metre is of two kinds viz, *Vṛtta* and *Jāti*. The former is regulated by 'gaṇas' or groups of three syllables, the differences between the groups being accounted for by the prosodial instants being short, or long in each syllable. It may be uniform (*sama*), the number of syllables in each quarter of the stanza remaining the same or uneven (*viṣama*) the number differing in the four-quarters of the stanza. The *jāti* is regulated by the syllabic instant the unit being that of a short vowel. The caesuras are to be marked at definite places. The Vedic metres recurred in the *Mahābhārata*. The *Anuṣṭubh* of the Vedic period became the *Śloka* of the classical period. Many among the Vedic metres disappeared in the classical period and, in their places many new metres sprang up.

The earliest text of the post Vedic period is the *Chandaśsutra* of Piṅgala or Piṅgalanāga. In style, it resembles the Vedic texts but the metres dealt with in it, are not derived from the Vedic text. Like Pāṇini, Piṅgala uses algebraic symbols while defining metres. To him is attributed the *Prakṛtacchandāśsutra*. He must have lived long before Kālidāsa.

To Kālidāsa are attributed the *Vṛttratnavali* and *Srutabodha* both dealing with the classical metres. The *Chandoviciti* of Janāśraya (circa 800 A. D.) gives illustrations for the rules from the works of earlier writers. The *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* of Varāhamihira (587 A. D.) contains a chapter on prosody while describing the movements of the planets. Kṣemendra's (1050 A. D.) *Suvṛttatilaka* contains references to the works of early writers. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.) wrote the *Chandonuśāsana* on metre. Kedārabhaṭṭa, who lived in the early part of the 15th century, is the author of the *Vṛttaratnākara* which became very popular since it was written. Other works are the *Chandomañjarī* of Gaṅgādāsa of the 15th century A. D., the *Vāṇībhūṣaṇa* of Dāmodaramiśra of the 16th century and the *Vāgvallabha* of Duhkhabhaṇjanakavi.

Among the classical metres, those which are popular are *Mandākrāntā*, *Vasantatilaka*, *Śārdulavikrīḍita*, *Śi'harinī*, *Anuṣṭubh*, *Aryā* and others.

Lexicography.

Lexica represent the continuation of the *Nirukta* which gave the interpretation to the words of the *Vedas*. The lexica gathered the words and presented them to the poets to choose the proper forms from them. These words were not taken from any particular text. While the *Nirukta* deals with nouns and verbs, the lexica deal with nouns and indeclinables and occasionally with verbs. The list of such words are given in verse form without being arranged in the alphabetical order, because these verses were to be memorised. The words included in the lexica are of two types viz, synonyms and homonyms. The words in the former are arranged under subject-matter. Sometimes the words are arranged according to the final or initial consonant or the two combined or according to the number of letters in the word. Gender is indicated in some cases. The nouns are given in the nominative case. The lexica deal purely with homonyms while those on synonyms include a section on homonyms.

Kātyāyana's *Namamala*, the lexicon by Vācaspati, that by Vikramāditya, one *Śabdārṇava*, *Samsārāvarta* and Vyāḍi's *Utpolini* are remembered as the earliest texts on this subject. All these are now lost. The earliest text which is now available is the *Nāmalingānuśāsina* of Amarasiṃha, a Buddhist writer who is mentioned as one of the nine gems in the court of King Vikramāditya. His date is fixed between 400 and 600 A. D. His lexicon, familiarly known as the *Amarakośa*, is synonymous in three sections called *kāṇḍas* and has an appendix on homonyms, indeclinables and genders. Śāśvata, who was as old as Amarasiṃha, is the author of the *Anekārthasamuccaya*. The *Abhidhānaratnamālā* was written by Halāyudha about 950 A. D. The *Vaijayanti* on synonyms and homonyms was written in the middle of the 11th century A. D. by Yādavaprakāśa, who was at first an Advaitin but was converted by Rāmānuja into a Viśiṣṭādvaitin. To Ajayapāla (1075-1140 A. D.) is ascribed the authorship of the *Nānārtharatnamālā* on homonyms. In the beginning of the 12th century, Keśavasvāmin wrote the *Nānārthārṇavasamksep* on homonymous words with meanings and genders, Maheśvara wrote the *Viśvaprakāśa* on synonyms and homonyms and also the *Sabdabheda-prakāśa* a supplement on it, and Hemacandra wrote the *Abhidhanacintāmaṇi* on synonyms including the gods of the Jains, the *Nighaṇṭuseṣa* a supplement to the former in the form of a botanic dictionary, and the *Anekārthasaṅgraha* on homonyms of words from one syllable up to six. The *Anekārthakośa* was written by Maṅkha, the author of the *Srikanthacarita*. The *Nāmamālā* and the *Nighaṇṭusamaya* are attributed to the authorship of the Jain Dhanañjaya who wrote the *Raghavapaṇḍāriya*. About 1200 A. D., Puruṣottamadeva wrote the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* a supplement to the *Nāmalingānuśāsina* on rare words mostly of Buddhistic origin and the *Hārāvali* on synonyms and homonyms. Bhaṭṭamalla, who lived before the 14th

century A. D., wrote the *Ākhyātacandrika* on verbs having the same meaning. The *Nānārtharatnamālā* was written in the latter half of the 14th century A. D. by Irugappaḍaṇḍanātha, minister of Harihara II. The *Sabdacandrikā* and *Sabdaratnākara* are the two lexica by Vāmanabhaṭṭabāna (circa 1420 A. D.). The *Anekārthaśīḍḍikośa* on homonyms was written by Medinīkara in the 14th century A. D. The *Kalpādrū*, a synonymous lexicon, is attributed to Keśavaḍaivajña who lived in the beginning of the 17th century A. D. To the authorship of Appayadīkṣita is attributed a synonymous lexicon *Nāmasaṅgrahamālā*. Besides these, there are lexica of the names *Ekākṣarakośa* with words of one syllable, *Dvirupakośa* with two syllables and so on. There are medical, astronomical or astrological glossaries of unknown date. The *Parsiprakāśa* is a dictionary of *Persian-Samskrta* words. In 1643, a lexicon of the name *Parsiprakāśa* was written by Vedāṅgarāya on astronomical and astrological terms. The *Paiyālacchi* of Dhanapāla (1000 A. D.) is a dictionary of the *Prakṛt* words. Similar in contents is the *Deśināmamālā* of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.). Encyclopaedic in contents are the lexica the *Vacaspaty* by Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati and the *Sabdakalpadruma* of Rādhākāntadeva, both of them being of recent origin.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

JYAUTIṢA.

This branch of the classical period goes back to the *Jyāutiṣa* branch of the Vedic period. Astronomy, astrology and mathematics formed the main divisions of this branch of study. The days were calculated and the constellations in conjunction with the planets were also observed. The Vedic calendar was luni-solar in character. Equinoxes and solstices were observed. Eclipses are mentioned to have been produced by the shadow cast on the planet by the earth. From the early days, the movements of the celestial bodies and their influence on the life of human beings were recognised and studied. This was dealt with in a separate branch of *Jyautiṣa* called astrology which is connected with and dependent on astronomy which is mainly concerned with the movements of planets. Predictions of the future in men's life were also formulated and the services of an astrologer were thought indispensable for a king both in times of peace and war. However, he was not given any high place since he was considered impure having nothing to do with the rituals. Calculations of the movements of the planets and working out their positions laid the foundations of mathematics. India has the credit of having founded the system of algebraic symbols and the system of notation. Much progress was made in geometry and trigonometry. The works available on *Jyautiṣa* treat with all these divisions or one or two among them.

The early treatises in astronomy are available only in fragments. The *Gargisamhitā*, *Vṛddhagargisamhitā* (older than 3000 B. C.) fragments from the works of Pauṣkarasādin, the appendices of the *Atharvaveda* on constellations and the *Paitamahāsiddhānta* are the works of the early writers. Varāhamihira, who died in 587 A. D., mentions Asitadevala, Garga, Vṛddhagarga, Nārada and Parāśara as the early authorities whose works are available in fragmentary form. From the evidence of the Greek records on India, the *Gargisamhitā* and the *Vṛddhagargisamhitā* are known to have existed in the centuries which preceded the Christian era. That the principles of astronomy were well-known to Indians during this period is evident from certain astronomical works and from the works of other writers on other subjects. The moon was known as a watery-planet.¹ The rain-bow was formed by the reflections of the sun's rays on the cloud laden with water.³ The positions and movements of the sun and

1. *Kumarasambhava* V 22.

2. " " VIII 31.

moon were actually observed. The nature of the ecliptic was rightly grasped. Only those stars that lie on the path of the sun, and other planets and those which lie near the ecliptic were observed and studied in their positions. The law of gravitation was understood. Spheres (*golas*), *ghaṭikas*, copper vessels resembling the lower half of a jar to measure time were the instruments used for observations.

From the *Pancasiddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira, it is learnt that there were five schools of astronomy under the names, *Pai āmaha*, *Romaka*, *Pauliṣa*, *Sūrya* and *Vasiṣṭha*. The *Paitāmahasiddhānta* was luni-solar in treatment. The *Romakasidahantā*, as its name suggests, dealt with the Greek principles of astronomy. It did not adopt the Indian *yuga* system but adopted its Metonic period. It gave a meagre account of the eclipses. The meridian for the city of the Greeks was calculated. The tropical revolutions of the sun and the moon were calculated. The *Pauliṣasiddhānta* was accurate in treatment. It gave a rough account of the eclipses. The difference in longitude between the city of the Yavanas and Ujjain was noted. It contained the tables of sines and made a contribution to spherical astronomy. Sidereal revolutions and anomalies in movements of planets were observed. The most accurate among these schools was that of *Sūrya*. It gave a general rule for the equation of the centre. It contained a full treatment of the eclipses. The *Vāsiṣṭha* school took into notice the irregularities in the positions and movements of planets.

The earliest known authority in Indian astronomy is Varāhamihira who died in 587 A. D. His *Pancasiddhāntikā* gives an account of the above-mentioned five astronomical schools. Lalla wrote about 748 A. D. the *Siṣyadhīvrddhitāntra* which was intended to increase the pupils' intelligence in astronomy. This was commented by Bhāskara in the 12th century A. D. The *Āryasiddhānta* was written about 950 A. D. by Āryabhaṭa. The *Vidyāmādhavīya* of unknown authorship and written before 1350 A. D. gives a clear exposition of the sayings of Vasiṣṭha, Brhaspati, Gārgya and others. Of uncertain date but definitely old is the *Vṛddharāsiṣṭhasamhitā*. The *Jyotiṛvidyābhāṣa* dealing with astronomical problems is definitely late in origin but is ascribed to the authorship of Kālidāsa.

The earliest work on astrology is the *Yavanajātaka* which is preserved in a Nepalese manuscript. There it is stated that in the 91st year, one Yavaneśvara translated his wordings into *Samskr̥ta* which took the shape of this work. The date, according to Bhaṭṭotpala (circa 1000 A. D.), refers to the *Saka* era. If reliance could be placed on this evidence, the work was composed in 169 A. D. Another work of the same name containing 4000 verses, was produced in the 191st year (268 A. D.) by one Sphūrjīdhvaja.

There are two other works of the same name of unknown date and authorship. One of them called the *Vṛddhayavanajātaka* has 8000 verses. Mīnarāja Yavanācārya is considered by some scholars as the author of the other one. As the title indicates, these *Yavanajātakas* deal with the astrological problems of Greek origin.

Varāhamihira divides the branch of *Jyautiṣa* into three parts viz., *Tantra* dealing with astronomy and mathematics, *Horā* with horoscopes, and *Samhitā* with astrology. His *Brhatsamhita* containing 106 chapters reveals his proficiency in various fields of knowledge. Having dealt with the planets and constellations, their movements and their influences on man's life, he gives a brief account of Indian geography, signs of weather, the characteristic marks of men, women, animals and birds, and the meaning of omens and of marriage. He betrays his knowledge of the sciences of love and politics. Questions of marriage are discussed by him in the *Brhadvirāhaphala* and *Svalpavivāhaphala* which are bigger and smaller treatises. His *Yogayātrā* deals with the conduct of war with kings. His *Brhajjataka* and *Laghujātaka* are valuable works on astrology.

The *Horāṣatpancāśikā* of Pṛthuyāśas (circa 600 A. D.) the son of Varāhamihira deals with nativities. The works of Varāhamihira and of his son Pṛthuyāśas were commented by Bhaṭṭotpala who lived about 996 A. D. He also wrote the *Horasastra*. To the authorship of Bhoja (1005-1054 A. D.), king of Dhārā, is attributed the *Vidvajjanavallabha*. Among the number of manuals written after this period on marriages and ceremonies, the *Tājikas* are of importance. They show Arabian and Persian influence. The most outstanding work of this type is the *Tājikā* of Nīlakanṭha written in 1587 A. D. Of uncertain date is the *Jyotiṣasāroddhāra* of Harṣakirtisuri.

Palmistry is treated in the *Sāmudrikatilaka* which was begun in 1160 A. D. by Durlabharāja and completed by his son Jagaddeva who is also credited with the authorship of the *Svapnacintāmaṇi* which deals with dreams. In 1176 A. D., Narahari wrote the *Narapatijaya-caryāsvarodaya* on magic diagrams marked with mystic letters. The *Adbhutasāgara*, which was begun in 1168 A. D. by Ballālasena and completed by his son Lakṣmaṇasena both being the kings of Bengal, deals with omens and prognostications. The *Ramalarahasya* of Bhayabhaṇjana of uncertain date deals with geomancy and *Pācakakevali* with cubomancy.

The treatment of mathematics denoted by the word *ganita* forms part of *Jyautiṣa*. Astronomy, arithmetic, and algebra are dealt with in ' *ganita* '. It treats also with geometry, which had its beginnings in the *Sulva sūtras*. Perfection was attained by the Indian mathematicians in the terminology of numeration up to *parārdha* (10, 14). Precision is another feature which characterises Indian arithmetic. The principle of subtractions was known in the Vedic period. The

numbers were treated as even and odd. The decimal scale of numeration was invented by the Indian mathematicians as also the algebraic symbols which were used to perfection in prosody and grammar. Constructions of rectilinear figures, mensuration of areas and volumes and the theorem of Pythagoras were all treated by the mathematicians of ancient India. A reference to the application of the principle of the theorem of Pythagoras is found in the *Srauta sutra* of Bodhāyana (800 B. C.) and the *Satapathabrāhmaṇa*.

Aryabhaṭa born in 476 A. D. in Kusumapura is the earliest Indian astronomer who wrote on mathematics with astronomical background. In 499 A. D. he wrote the *Āryabhaṭīya* containing ten stanzas in *Āryametre*, and the *Daśigītikāśutra* containing 108 stanzas in the *Āryāmetre*. The last mentioned work has 33 stanzas on mathematics, 25 on measurement of time and 50 on sphere. Aryabhaṭa held that the earth was a sphere and it rotated on its axis. His conception of the eclipses was the same as that held by the moderners. He dealt with evolution, involution, area, volume, circles, progressions, and algebraic identities. He knew the accurate value of π . The *Laṭhubhaskarīya* and *Mahabhaskariya* were written by Bhāskara pupil, of Āryabhaṭa.

Brahmagupta who was born in 598 A. D. wrote in 628 A. D., the *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta* which includes a chapter in solving astronomical problems. He was proficient in mathematics. In 665 A. D., he composed the *Khaṇḍakhādīyaka* which is a work giving aids for astronomical calculations.

The Bakshali manuscript, which is dated in the 8th century A. D., treats mathematics in the *sutra* style. At the beginning of the 10th century A. D., the *Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha* was composed by Mahāvīrācārya. It is simpler than the work of Brahmagupta and deals with geometrical progressions. The *Triṣaṭi* on quadratic equations was written in 991 A. D. by Śrīdhara. On *Karaṇa* was written the *Rājamṛgāṅka* by King Bhoja of Dhāra in 1042 A. D.

Bhāskarācārya wrote in 1172 A. D. the *Siddhāntaśiromaṇi* which has four parts viz. (1) *Līlāvati* dealing with combinations (2) *Bījagaṇita* with algebra (3) *Grahaṅgaṇita* on astronomical calculations and (4) *Gola* on astronomical problems and astronomical instruments. In 1183 was written by him the *Karaṇakutuhala* on *karaṇa*. On *karaṇa* was written the *Bhāsvati* by Śatānanda of unknown date. In 1643, Mālajit, who was awarded the title Vedāṅgarāya by his patron Shah Johan the Muslim Emperor, composed a work called *Pārsiprakāśa* which gives the methods by which the Hindu dates could be converted into Mahomedan dates.

There are certain coincidences between Greek and Indian astronomy. In both, the terms used to refer to the signs of the zodiac are similar. The word *yavana* used with the names of the treatises on

Indian astronomy suggests its connection with the Greek astronomy. Other points are the parallax methods of calculations, study of the heliacal setting and rising of the luminaries, the correct measurements of days and nights, and the naming of the week days after the names of the planets. The critics of the West seek to prove on the strength of these coincidences that Indian astronomy owed to Greek astronomy its origin and development. This contention is however wrong. The features of Indian astronomy, which are said to resemble those of Greek astronomy, had been in existence even before 500 B. C. as shown by the *Dharmasutra* of Baudhāyana. A number of valuable treatises were taken away from India by the Greeks on their return to Greece along with Alexander. Probably, their astronomical knowledge got enriched through the materials borrowed from India thus betraying the features similar to those in Indian astronomy. It may also be conceded that the development of Indian astronomy was influenced to some extent by the contact of the Indian astronomers with the Greeks. It must therefore be admitted that Indian astronomy had an independent origin and development. Astronomy does not belong merely to the sphere of imagination. It presupposes continued observation of planetary positions and observations and accurate mathematical calculations of them.

CHAPTER XXIX.

DHARMA ŚĀSTRA.

The *Kalpisutras* formed an important supplement to the *Vedas*. They contain in them the foundations of the rules of law evolved in the later period. Among them, the *Dharmasutras* dealt with those religious duties and secular in origin. The *Dharmasutras* lay down the rules for the daily routine life of a person. At a later period, these gave room for further development to the growth of materials which resulted in the writing of the *Dharmaśāstras*. The writing of these treatises was actively assisted by the epics and the *Puranas* which, in particular *Mahabharata*, contain lengthy discourses on topics common to these. Passages from these and other sources were incorporated in the *Dharmaśāstras*. It is in this line that the didactic element in these treatises is to be accounted for. They also contain passages which are common since they were taken from the same source. The question of borrowing of the materials from one by another treatise cannot however be decided on this ground. Generally, these treatises are in the form of verse and prose, the latter form being used to discuss the topics in question.

The word 'dharma' means duty. 'It is a conception.' It also deals with ethics and gives means for atonement. 'Law (*vyavahāra*) is an integral part of religion and ethics (*dharma*).' In the main, there are four aspects of the practises with which the *Dharmaśāstras* deal. They are *ācāra* which refers to immemorial practises, *vyavahāra* based on legal and government practises, *prāyaścitta* which are expiatory and *karmaphala* based on the consequences of the acts already done. The duties apply to the man and the woman to be observed by them or avoided during the various stages of life (*aśrama*), according to the castes (*varṇa*) which they profess and in the various circumstances during one's life-time.

The rise of the various *Dharmasutras* was to satisfy the need felt by the people on the secular side of life which the Vedic texts did not fulfil. The earlier treatises are the *Dharmasutra* of Gautama (600—400 B. C.), *Baudhayana dharmasutra* (500—200 B. C.) *Āpastambadharmasutra* (600—300 B. C.) *Vāsiṣṭhadharmasutra*, *Viṣṇudharmasutra* (300—100 B. C.), *Hārīta dharmasutra*, the *Dharmasutras* of Śaṅkha-likhita (300—100 B. C.), and of Vikhanas, Paithīnāsī, Uśanas, Kāśyapa and Brhaspati.

The *Manusmṛti* or *Manavadharmaśāstra* is the earliest available law book which covers a wide sphere of topics beginning from the creation and ending with a philosophical discourse of the Vedānta type. The

text, as available now, has twelve chapters and is said to have been uttered by Bhṛgu. From this it appears that Bhṛgu gave publicity to the utterances of Manu. There are also references to Manu's opinion probably of some other Manu. Yāska's *Nirukta* and the *Mahā-bharata* refer to Manu. He is the earliest authority on law. This however does not give any clue in fixing the date of the work. It travelled to Burma, Siam and Java and influenced the writing of law-books there on its model. Among the commentaries, the best known are by Medhātithi (825–900) and Kullūka bhaṭṭa about 1200 A. D.

Next in importance to the *Manusmṛti* is the *Yajñavalkyasmṛti* which is placed between 100 B. C. and 300 A. D. It has three chapters one each on *Ācara*, *Vyavahāra* and *Prāyaścitta*. Like the *Manusmṛti*, it deals also with the Vedānta doctrines. The popularity and authority of this are revealed by the three, among many commentaries which have gained unique reputation. It was commented in the (1) *Balakriḍā* by Viśvarūpa (800–825 A. D.)¹, (2) *Miāḷṣarā* by Vijnāneśvara in 1120 under the Cālukya King Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāṇa and (3) *Aparār-kayājñavalkyadharmasāstranibandha* by Aparārka in the first half of the 12th century A. D. Among these, the *Miāḷṣarā* is treated to be an independent treatise on law by itself. It was commented by Bālabhaṭṭa also called Bālakṛṣṇa, son of Vaidyanātha Pāyagunḍa (1750 A. D.) the grammarian who was the pupil of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa. It is also held that the work was written by Vaidyanātha himself. It is called *Lakṣmīyakyāna* or *Balambhaṭṭi* and it is held that the author, whether Vaidyanātha or his son, ascribed it to Lakṣmīdevi wife of Vaidyanātha. The work lays great stress on the women's claims to property rights.

The *Nāradaśmṛti* (100–300 A. D.)² is available in a larger and a shorter version. Bāṇa was aware of its existence. The *Parasasmṛti*, it is held, is lost in its bigger version. The smaller version is available on which Mādhava (1297–1386 A. D.) of Vijayanagar wrote a commentary. The date of the original text is put between 100 and 500 A. D.³ The *Brhaspatiśmṛti* (200–400 A. D.), which is available in fragments, can be styled as a criticism on the *Manusmṛti*. Besides these, there are a number of *Smṛti* texts whose number is given as 152.

Of great value are the digests on law. They are numerous and are highly authoritative. Jīmutavāhana in the 12th century A. D. wrote a legal work called *Dharmaratna* having three parts named, *Kālaviveka*, *Vyavahāramātrikā* and *Dāyabhlāga*. In the same period was written the *Smṛtikalpataru* by Lakṣmīdhara. For king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal was written the *Brāhmaṇasarvasva* by Halāyudha at about 1200 A. D. About 1225 A. D., Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa com-

1. A History of *Dharmaśāstra* by P. V. Kane Vol. I, p. 263.

2. " " p. XXIX.

3. " " p. XXX.

posed the *Smṛticandrikā*. Varadarāja, who lived in the 13th century A. D., wrote a voluminous work called the *Smṛtisangraha* of which is available only a portion called *Vyavahāranirṇaya*. The *Caturvargacintamani* on *Vrata*, *Dāna*, *Tirtha* and *Mokṣa* together with an appendix was written by Hemādri about 1270 A. D. and it is highly valuable as it contains quotations from various writers. The *Madanapārijata* on religious duties and laws of succession is attributed to Viśveśvara (circa 1400 A. D.). To the same period belongs the *Smṛtiratnakara* of Candēśvara and *Kālamadhaviya* of Mādhava who commented on Parāśara's *smṛti*. In the next century was written a number of smaller treatises called *Cintamani* by Vācaspati. In the 16th century were composed the *Sarasvativilāsa* by Pratāparudradeva of Utkala, small treatises called *Tatvas* on ordeals and procedures by Raghunandana, and the *Smṛtimuktaphala* by Vaidyanāthadīkṣita. In the next century. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita wrote the *Tithinirṇaya*, Kamalakara-bhaṭṭa (1612 A. D.) wrote the *Nirṇayasindhu*, Nīlakaṇṭha (1630 A. D.) the *Bhagavantabhāskara*, and Mitramiśra the encyclopaedic *Viramītrodaya*.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE UPAVEDAS

ĀYURVEDA, GĀNDHARVA VEDA, DHANURVEDA AND ARTHA ŚĀSTRA.

In addition to the *Vedas* and their supplements, there are four *Upavedas* or secondary *Vedas*. They are *Āyurveda*, *Gāndharva-veda*, *Dhanurveda* and *Arthaśāstra*. They represent the sciences of medicine, music, archery and politics respectively. The science of love is included under the *Āyurveda*.

ĀYURVEDA

The system of medicine is called *Āyurveda* which is considered as a secondary *Veda*. The word *Āyurveda* means that with which life is obtained. The origin of this *Veda* is to be traced to the *Atharvaveda*. The Vedic texts contain references to embryology, hygiene and anatomy. The texts which are now available mention Ātreya, Kāśyapa, Hārīta, Agniveśa and Bela. Each one, it is held, wrote a text on the *Āyurveda* or was the founder of a school of *Āyurveda*.

The development of the *Āyurveda* is closely connected with the development of the *Dharmaśāstra*. The *Purāṇas* and the law books contain some accounts of medicine. The duties of man contained in the law books and also in the *Purāṇas* have a bearing on the principles of hygiene. They have influenced the *Āyurveda* which draws an account of the life of man to be led in the light of principles enunciated in the *Dharmaśāstra*. The *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* systems of thought have influenced the development of the metaphysical side of the *Āyurveda* while the *Vedānta* system has influenced the spiritual side. Remedies for the diseases have been devised in conformity with the main doctrines of these systems. Some of the religious practices have impressed the *Āyurveda* to a large extent. The restrictions on the nature of food, as sought to be observed by the followers of the Hindu religion are recognised in the *Āyurveda* as indispensable for the upkeep of the soul in a healthy body. The nature of the food, the type and manner of taking it together with the time and place have much to contribute to the growth of the constitution of the mind and the body. The three qualities *Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas* which belong to the matter are closely related to and greatly influenced by the three humours of the body viz, *Kapha*, *Vāta* and *Pitta*. Food is to be taken not

for the mere satisfaction of hunger or merely for the growth of the body. The nature of the food is to be determined by the quality of food which would help the increase of *sattva*. Hence the *Āyurveda* system deals with the principles of ethics.

The *Āyurveda* system deals with life in all its phases philosophical and biological. It includes in its treatment the preventive and curative sides of medicine and surgery. Among the three humours recognised in the system, *Kapha* stands for the function of 'cooling and preservation and production of various fluids' *e g.* mucus., *Vāta* or *Vāyu* includes 'all phenomenon of motion which come under the functions of cell-life', and *Pitta* represents 'the function of metabolism and heat-production' (process of digestion, coloration of blood etc.). While preparing remedies for ailment, great care is taken to understand the derangement of the three humours and the effect of the seasons on the health of the person is also taken into account. Treatments are divided into hot and cold. The circulation of blood is studied with fair clearness. Surgery was practised including major operations like amputation, laparotomy and trephining of the skull. The early texts contain descriptions of surgical instruments. Embryology was studied and practised.¹ Consumption is treated in detail. The critics of the West attempt, in vain, to prove the Greek origin for Indian medicine.

The *Āyurveda* has eight sections of study *viz.*, 1. *Śalya* surgery and midwifery, 2. *Śālākya* study of the diseases of the head and its organs, 3. *Kāyacikitsā* science and art of medicine; 4. *Bhūtavidyā* psycho-therapy, 5. *Kaumārabhṛtya* treatment of children, 6. *Agadatantra* toxicology 7. *Rasāyanatantra* on elixirs and 8. *Vājīkaraṇatantra* on rejuvenation. There were specialists in each of these sections.

From the text books now available, it is understood that Ātreya Punarvasu was the formulator of the *Āyurveda*. From the Buddhist records, it is learnt that the physician Ātreya lived at Taxila before the birth of Gautama the Buddha, that is, before 600 B. C. He taught this system to Agniveśa who in turn taught it to Caraka. Caraka and one Dṛḍhabala put what they were taught in a book-form called the *Carakasamhitā*. Caraka is the oldest authority on medicine. Indian tradition identifies him with the grammarian Patañjali (150 B. C.). The Buddhist *Piṭakas* speak of Caraka as the physician in the court of King Kaṇiṣka (1st Century A. D.) Therefore Caraka who was a native of Gāndhāra, may be taken to have lived in the 1st Century A. D. Dṛḍhabala, who is quoted by Vāgbhata in the 6th century A. D., must have lived in the 4th century A. D. He added his own materials and recast the

1. *Rāmāyaṇa* — *Sundarakāṇḍa* 28-6.

work of Caraka. The *Carakasamhitā* which is in eight parts has thirty chapters. The eight parts are (1) *Sūtrasthāna* on remedies, and diet and also duties of a doctor, (2) *Nidānasthāna* on chief diseases (3) *Vimānasthāna* on pathology, medical studies and duties of a medical student. (4) *Śārīrasthāna* on anatomy and embryology, (5) *Indriyasthāna* on diagnosis and prognosis, (6) *Cikitsāsthāna* on special therapy, and 7 and (8) *Kalpasthāna* and *Siddhi* on general therapy. It was translated into Arabic about 800 A. D. and into Persian even earlier. It is in the form of prose and verse.

Suśruta is the author of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* a valuable treatise on the *Āyurveda* stressing importance on surgery. He speaks of surgical instruments and surgical operations. His name spread to the foreign lands in the 9th century A.D.

The *Kāśyapasaṃhitā* in 13 chapters deals with incantations to cure the effects of poison. The *Bhelal (Bheda) saṃhitā* is available in a single manuscript and in a defective form. The *Nāvanīṭaka* or Bower Manuscripts discovered in 1890 contain valuable information on powders, oils, elixirs and so on. It is supposed to be the cream of all other earlier texts. The date of this text is fixed in 4th century A. D. On *Kaumārabhr̥tya* is available the *Vṛddhajīvakīyā* by Vṛddhajīvaka in a fragmentary form.

In the 6th century A. D. Vāgbhaṭa wrote his *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya* and *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha*. He was the grandson of another Vāgbhaṭa and son of Simhagupta. I-tsing (672-675 A. D.) is said to have referred to the works of Vāgbhaṭa. Both the Vāgbhaṭas are considered by the critics of the West as Buddhists but the Hindu principles of life which colour the two works prove them to be Hindus. The older Vāgbhaṭa is taken by the critics as the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* and the younger as the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya*. There is no evidence to prove that the authors of the two works were different. The *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* appears to have been composed with the materials gathered from earlier works. The *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥ddaya* which is also known as *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥dayasaṃhitā* is found based on the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha*. At present, the *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya* enjoys unique popularity.

To one Nāgajuna is attributed the authorship of the *Yogasāra* and *Yogaśāstra*. The identity of the author is not established. He is identified by some critics with Nāgārjuna the Buddhist philosopher who is said to have flourished in the court of King Kaniska. On pathology was written the *Rugvinīścaya* by Mādhavakara in the 8th century A. D. The prescriptions for curing diseases were given by Vṛnda of uncertain date in his *Siddhiyoga* which is also called *Vṛndamādhava*. Vṛnda's influence is felt in the *Cikitsāsāra*

on therapeutics written about 1060 A. D. by Ćakrapāṇidatta. Another work called *Cikitsāsāra* was written in the same century by Vangasena. On the same subject was written the *Cikitsāmṛta* about 1224 A. D. by Milhaṇa. In the 13th century A. D. was an original and ancient work of the system of medicine *Śārṅgadharaśamhitā* commented by Vopadeva, the founder of a school of grammar called after his name. To his authorship is attributed a work called *Sataśśloki* which deals with powders and pills. Equally valuable are the *Cikitsākalikā* of Tisaṭa in the 14th century, *Bhāvaprakāśa* of Bhāvamisra of the 16th century and *Vaidyajīvana* of Lolimbarāja of the 17th century.

Importance was given, in the *Āyurveda* system, to the metallic preparations and to quick-silver among the metals. It was used to transmute base metals. It was also used to prepare elixirs. Nāgārjuna is said to have written the *Rasaratnākara* which treats this subject. The *Rasaratnasamuccaya*, whose date is fixed in 1300 A. D., is attributed to Vāgbhaṭa or Āsviniṅkumāra or Nityanātha. The last mentioned author wrote also the *Rasaratnākara*. The importance given to quick silver resulted in the rise of a system of thought called *Raseśvarasiddhānta* which is treated in the *Śarvadarśanasaṅgraha*. Śiva and Pārvatī are the presiding deities of this system.

There are medical treatises for curing the diseases of animals, trees and others. Surapāla's *Vṛkṣāyurveda* treats the diseases of plants. Nārāyaṇa's *Mātāṅgalīlā* deals with the diseases of elephants. On the diseases of horses are the *Aśvāyurveda* of Gaṇa, *Aśvavaidyaka* of Jayadatta and Dīpaṅkara, *Yogamañjarī* of Vardhamāna, *Aśvacikitsā* of Nakula, *Śālihotra* attributed to King Bhoja of Dhara and the *Aśvaśāstra* of Sukhānanda.

There are lexica on the subject of medicine. They are the *Dhanvantarinighaṇṭu* of uncertain date, Sureśvara's (1075 A. D.) *Sābdapradīpa* Narahari's (1235-50 A. D.) *Rājanighaṇṭu*, Maḍana-pāla's (1374 A. D.) *Madanavinodanighaṇṭu* on materia medica and *Pathyāpathyanighaṇṭu* of unknown authorship on dietetics.

KĀMAŚĀSTRA

The science of love or *Kāmaśāstra* is included under the *Vājīkaraṇa* section of the *Āyurveda*. The earliest treatise written on this topic is the *Kāmasūtra* by Vātsyāyana Mallanāga a physician. The various aspects of love are dealt with frankly and freely. Happiness is shown to be procurable through marriage. Love is to be dealt with in a manner as not to lower down the values of *Dharma* and *Artha*. The text, which contains seven chapters, is placed in the 2nd century A. D. Vātsyāyana mentions Bābhavya, Cārāyaṇa, Gonardīya and others as the earlier exponents on this subject.

Some among these happen to be the exponents on other subjects. They are mentioned in the *Arthśāstra* and the *Mahābhāṣya*. Dattaka, mentioned by Vātsyāyana, wrote the *sūtras* on love which are lost. This *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana was commented in the *Jayamangala* written by Yaśodhara (1243-61 A. D.). Other works on the subject are the *Pañcasāyaka* of Jyotirīśvara who lived after the 11th century A. D., the *Ratirahasya* of Kokkoka written before 1200 A. D., the *Fatimañjarī* of Jayadeva of uncertain date, the *Ratiratnapradīpikā* of Immadi Praudhadevarāya (1422-48 A. D.) King of Vijayanagar, the *Anaṅgarāṅga* of Kalyāṇamalla in the 16th century A. D., and the *Kandarpacintāmaṇi* of Virabhadra in the same century.

GĀNDHARVA VEDA

The *Gāndharvaveda* is a secondary *Veda* and it is connected with the *Śāmaveda*. It includes dancing and music. The Vedic accent was responsible for the development of the *svaras* in Indian music. The *Purāṇas* contain an account of music and dancing. Sadāśiva, Brahmā and Bharata are the earliest authorities on dancing. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* laid the foundations of dancing and music. The very title *Nāṭyaśāstra* shows the importance given in it to dramatic gestures which have music as their ancillary. From the quotations of later writers, it appears that there were two authorities who had the names *Vṛddhabharata* and *Bharata*. The former wrote a *Nāṭyavedāgama* otherwise called the *Dṛdaśasāhasrī* which is available only in quotations. The latter wrote the *Nāṭyaśāstra* which is called the *Śatasāhasrī*. While dealing with these gestures in detail, Bharata treats sentiment and dramatic action. Hence the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is treated as an authority on music, dancing, drama, and rhetoric. Dattila, pupil of Bharata, wrote a treatise called *Dattila* on music and dancing which is now lost. Nandikeśvara or Nandin is said to have composed the *Bharatārṇava* in 400 verses on music and dancing. He was probably a contemporary of Bharata. The *Nāṭyārṇava* and *Abhinayadarpaṇa*, which are said to have formed part of the original *Bharatārṇava*, are now available. They deal in detail with the art of dance. The date of these two works is placed in the 2nd century A. D. Rāmacandra (circa 1200 A. D.), a pupil of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.) wrote along with one Guṇacandra, the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* with a commentary on it.

Melody is given importance in Indian music. To add to its charm every phase of music was developed to perfection. A careful and critical study of sound in all its varieties was made. The audible sound is called *Sruti* and twenty-two varieties in *sruti* are recognised by the exponents of music. The *Sruti* produces the *svara* which is the

smooth and charming sound and it pleases the listener by itself¹. The *ragas* are produced out of the *svaras* which are grouped in a manner to produce the progression of notes according to accepted laws of melody. Great stress is laid on the place of 'Gamaka' in music which is produced by the graceful polish given to the *svaras*². Strict attention is paid to execution and accuracy in music which is set in a religious background. Music is broadly divided as vocal and instrumental. The flute, the lute (*Vīṇā* with many strings, and the drums are the national instruments. The Vedic-texts refer to the instruments of music. Music is twofold viz, *mārga* and *deśī*. The former is shaped according to the rules of music while the latter is intended to please popular taste.

The *Yamalāṣṭakatantras* deal to some extent with music. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the early authoritative text on music. Kohala, the pupil of Bharata, is said to have written a work on music of which only the *Tālādhyāya* is now available. Mataṅga, who lived before the 4th century B. C., wrote the *Brhaddeśī* on the *deśī* type of music which is available in fragments. His views on music are quoted by Abhinavagupta and other writers. The *Saṅgītamakaranda* is attributed to the authorship of Nārada. The text, which is now available, refers to the view of Abhinavagupta. The critics place it between the 7th and the 11th century A. D. Under Singhana of the Yādavas (1132-1169 A. D.), Śārṅgadeva, who styles himself as Niśśaṅka, wrote the *Saṅgītaratnākara* a treatise on music in seven chapters. His erudition in music, philosophy and medicine is clearly revealed in this work. His is an original treatise on the subject which he defines, illustrates and discusses. In 1180 A. D., Nānyadeva wrote the *Sarasvatīhrdayālāṅkārahāra* in seventeen chapters on the rules for the *ragas*. Someśvara, the son of Cālukya Vikramāditya, the patron of Bilhana, composed in the first half of the 12th century A.D. the *Mānasollāsa* which deals with music and musical instruments. Other important works are the *Saṅgītasamayāsāra* of the Jain Pārśvadeva of the 13th century, the *Saṅgītasudhākara* of Haripāla in the beginning of the next century and the *Saṅgītasāra* of Vidyāraṇya identified with Mādhava (C. 1350 A. D.). In the beginning of the next century, the *Saṅgitacintāmaṇi* was written by Vemabhūpāla, the Reddi prince. Great was the contribution made to this branch by the *Saṅgitarāja* written in 1440 A. D. by Kumbhakarna. On the *rāgas* of the Karnatic music was written the *Svaramelakalānidhi* by Rāmāmātya in the middle of the 16th century. The North Indian music was enriched by the contribution of Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala (C. 1600) who wrote the *Nartananirṇaya*, *Rāgmañjari*, *Rāgamālā* and *Śaḍrāgacandrikā*. Govindadikṣita

1. Śārṅgadeva : *Saṅgītaratnākara* I 3-24-25.

2. " " " " II 3-87.

(C. 1600) wrote the *Saṅgītasudhā* for King Raghunātha Nāyak of Tanjore. Other works written in the same century are the *Rāgavibodha* of Somanātha written in 1609 A. D., the *Saṅgitadarpa* of Caturadāmodara, the *Caturdaṇḍiprakāśikā* of Veṅkaṭamakhin son of Govindadīkṣita, the *Saṅgitasārasaṅgraha* of Jagajjyotirmalla King of Nepal (1617-1633 A. D.) who also wrote the play *Hara-gaurivivāha*, the *Saṅgitapārijāta* of Ahobila and the *Saṅgitadāmodara* of Subhāṅkara. The *Bālarāmabharata* is on music and dancing by Bālarāmavarman King of Travancore (1753-1798 A. D.)

ARTHA ŚĀSTRA

Politics is designated as *Arthaśāstra* which deals with the second pursuit of life. The principles of the *Arthaśāstra* are found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. The beginnings of this system are to be traced to the didactic verses in the *Mahābhārata*, *Dharmaśāstra* and other texts. Indra is said to be the author of a treatise *Bāhudantaka* on politics. The *Smṛtis* of Manu and Yājñavalkya contain information on political problems. The system is also called *Nitiśāstra*, *Rājanīti* and *Daṇḍanīti*. Bṛhaspati is taken as a great authority on the *Arthaśāstra*.

The earliest available treatise is the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya who is also called Cāṇakya. Bṛhaspati, Uśanas, Viśālākṣa, Bharadvāja, Parāśara and others are cited as the authorities. The work is divided into fifteen sections each having sub divisions. Each sub-division is in prose with a verse at the end summarising the contents in that division. There are also found certain *sūtras* which are commented but their authorship is not known. The work gives detailed information about practical life. It deals with various topics connected with the administration of the state. Some of them are the training to be given to the princes, the council of ministers, value of spies, work of ambassadors, control of administration, law, offence, penalty, inflation, taxation, the six expedients of a monarch, vices of kings, priests and bards, some magic devices and so on. The aim, in writing the *Arthaśāstra*, is to provide the existing state with security. The king is no more than a servant of the state.

The authorship of the work is attributed to Cāṇakya also called Viṣṇugupta or Kauṭilya who was the minister of the Mauryan King Candragupta. The fragmentary records of India left by Megasthenes agree in contents with the *Arthaśāstra*. Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita* refers to the *Arthaśāstra* of Viṣṇugupta in 6000 stanzas¹. From the style of the work, the date of the work can be fixed about 320 B. C.

Whoever might have been the author, the text of the *Arthaśāstra*

1. *Daśakumāracarita* Ch. VIII.

shows the author's developed sense of political wisdom. It makes clear that those who are not too idealistic or too scrupulous in their dealings could govern the land with efficiency " Throughout it is characterised by a freshness and realism which suggest that the author had first-hand experience of the actual problems of which he so engagingly writes "1

The science of politics is treated in the *Sukranitisāra* in 2200 stanzas which is said to be a condensed version of a bigger work. From the nature of the treatment of the subject and the style of the work the work could be placed in the pre-Christian era.

The *Nitisāra* of Kāmandaka is based on the *Arthasāstra* of Kauṭilya. It refers to Viṣṇugupta. It has a number of didactic verses. It is known to Vāmana the author of the *Kāvyaṭīkā*. The date of the work may be placed in the 7th century A. D. Somadevasūri who is identified by some scholars with the author of the same name who wrote the *Yaśastilaka*, wrote the *Nitivākyāmrta*. Being a Jain, the author does not agree with the author of the *Arthasāstra* regarding administration and war. He preaches morals to the rulers. The *Laghu Arhanniti* of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.) reveals his Jain bias. Other works on politics are the *Yuktikalpataru* of Bhoja (1040 A. D.) of Dhārā, *Nitiratnākara* of Candēśvara, *Nītiprakāśikā* and others.

DHANUR VEDA

The *Dhanurveda* the science of archery, is considered to be a secondary *Veda*. It is considered to have four parts *viz*, training, receiving the weapons, training with weapons and their use. Viśvāmitra, Vikramāditya, Sadāśiva and Śārngadatta are considered to be the authors of some treatises on archery but they are not available. The *Kodandamaṇḍana* is also a treatise on archery. The *Viracintāmaṇi* of Śārngadhara (1363 A. D.) deals with the topics of fighting.

ANCILLARY SCIENCES.

The *Silpaśāstra* or *Vāstuvidyā*, which represents the branch of architecture, was a highly developed system in ancient India. The Buddhists and the Jains have contributed much to its development. Religion and utilitarianism were its main features. The huge temples of South India, *stūpas*, *vihāras*, *cītyas*, and others found at Sarnath and Ajanta reflect the intellectual and moral culture of the master

1. History of Indian Civilisation by C. E. M. Joad P. 83

builders of ancient India. Town planning formed part of this branch. 'Scientific exactness, remarkable commonsense and references to the sanitary requirements and to the military needs of the community' were the noteworthy features of the system of architecture which are revealed in the texts representing this branch. The *Mayamata*, *Sanatkumāravāstusāstra*, *Mānasāra* on architecture and sculpture, *Silparatna* of Śrikumāra of the 16th century A. D. and the *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* of King Bhoja of Dhārā (1040 A. D.) are the treatises on architecture. The *Mānasāra* deals with everything that is built according to a design and with an artistic finish. Maṇḍana, an architect in the service of King Kumbhakarna (1419-1469 A. D.), wrote the works *Vāstumāṇḍana*, and *Prāsādamāṇḍana*.

Painting was also practised in ancient India to perfection. The *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* contains an account on this topic. The frescoes of Ajanta bear testimony to the perfection achieved in this sphere. Indian painting and sculpture avoid the crude realism of bones and muscles and concentrate on spiritual expression. Music, dancing, painting and architecture were intended to present the beauty of the world. Things which are considered beautiful have in them God's presence reflected. The purpose of these arts is therefore a noble one namely glorifying God or communicating one's feelings to God. The greatness of God, which defies comprehension and expression in words, is best recorded through the medium of these arts. 'Art, in fact, is the window through which men may gaze upon reality'¹ The pictures, which are painted, are divided as *viddha* and *aviddha*. The former shows the accurate drawing while the latter gives an idea of the original without reference to any degree of accuracy. References to these types are found in the *Abhilāṣitārthacintāmaṇi* of Someśvara, son of Cālukya Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāṇa (circa 1200 A. D.), and the *Tilakamañjarī* of Dhanapāla (circa 1000 A. D.). The *Pañcadaśī* of Vidyāraṇya of Vijayanagar in the 14th century A. D. deals with painting. It is now lost. At present, there is no work available to represent this art.

The use of the gems gave rise to the growth of the branch *Ratnaśāstra* of which there is some account included in the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* of Varāhamihira. The texts available on this subject are the *Agastimata*, *Ratnaparikṣā* of Buddhabhaṭṭa, the *Navaratnaparikṣā* of Nārāyaṇa and others.

Stealing also was considered as an art. Kaṇṇisuta and Mūladeva are mentioned as authorities in this art and as the authors of treatises on theft which are now lost. A work called *Ṣaṇmukhaśāstra* is now available.

1. History of Indian civilisation by C. E. M. Joad P. 63.

Botanical study was made in the ancient days. A separate branch of study under the name Botany does not appear to have existed. References to the plants and trees, their growth and development under changed conditions and other aspects concerned with them are available in the *Vṛkṣāyurveda*¹, *Agnipurāṇa Arthasāstra*, *Bṛhatsamhitā*, *Suśrutasamhitā* and Śankaramiśra's commentary on the *Viśeṣika sūtras*. Śārngadhara wrote in the 13th century the *Upavanavinoda* on plants in all their aspects.

The name of one Nāgārjuna is connected with the development of the branch of chemistry. He is considered to have been an early authority on medicine and chemistry. His contribution to metallic preparations of compounds particularly of mercury and iron is mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Hieun Thsang (629-645 A. D.) and the Muslim scholar Alberuni (1017-30 A. D.) Nāgārjuna is said to have written a book on alchemy. The drugs prepared out of arsenic were used internally for medical purposes. Suśruta discusses the preparation and use of alkalies and alkaline caustics. The Kutub pillar, which is still free from rust and with the words inscribed on it still clear even after fourteen centuries, reveals the methods of manufacturing steel and using it for definite purposes. The *Rasārṇava* and *Rasaratnasamuccaya* give methods for the extraction of zinc from ores. The Buddhists had made a good contribution to the branch of chemistry. The migration of the Buddhists to China and Tibet with their valuable treasures in chemistry was mainly responsible for the gradual decline in India of science and medicine in general.

1. There is a treatise of Vāgbhaṭa bearing this title. Studies in the History of Indian Plants by P. K. Gode, Acharya Dhruva Commemoration Volume Part III.

CHAPTER XXXI.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND SYSTEMS OF THOUGHT

The term 'philosophy' means, love of wisdom. It denotes the desire to acquire wisdom or knowledge. This knowledge is about the world in relation to the spirit. It represents the desire to understand the origin and development of a theme concerning the spirit in relation to the world. Logical arguments are resorted to while attempting to arrive at a conclusion. Thus philosophy is highly speculative.

The term religion denotes a faith or belief which is put to practice. The faith is concerned with the individual souls and the Supreme Being and their mutual relation. God's supremacy over souls and matter is admitted. Religion thus becomes a matter of experience. It is a sort of spiritual discovery in which the Supreme Being, defying the reach of intellect, is felt. This experience is vivid, direct, fresh and thrilling. Thus religion is practical and receptive.

Philosophy and religion, which are different in their characteristic outlook, are kept separate in the Western countries, but in India, they are treated together and no line of demarcation is drawn between them. In India, philosophy while being speculative searches for truth and does not stop there. It prescribes also a way of life to approach that truth. In this latter aspect, it does the work of religion. That is, there is nothing like philosophy in India which is utterly disentangled from the phases of religion. Philosophy opens the door to knowledge while religion shows the path to that knowledge. The goal in life is, therefore, the attainment of the reality which is established by philosophical discussions. This inter-relation between philosophy and religion has been maintained in India by two main factors which characterise the Indian faith viz., (1) The world is spiritual with both matter and spirit being present there, and (2) There is unity in the universe which is diverse. On account of these two factors, it is recognised that the ultimate truth is only one and the same but its approaches, which the religious practises represent, are different. These approaches are made at the getting to the truth from different angles. Therefore not only are the religions different but also the philosophical conceptions of the ultimate truth. Thus there is found one unity in the diverse world of faiths. The principle was thoroughly grasped by the

Indians in ancient India and this has tended to the growth of the spirit of tolerance which the followers of one faith extended to those who professed the faiths quite opposed to their own. It is mainly because of this spirit of tolerance which was observed by the followers of different faiths that there was the occasion for the rise and growth of the different systems of thought and of faiths side by side.

The conduct of man as laid down in the *Dharmaśāstras* is based on the principles of religion evolved by speculation. Order and regularity of conduct were expected to be observed by those who put them to practise and this was achieved by the evolution of the caste system and orders in life (*āśramas*). The caste system has been 'an attempt to harmonise in a single social whole so many diverse racial elements to many different traditions, rituals, and customs into a single culture and single religion. The system of the '*āśramas*' has been very helpful in assigning a particular work to an individual at a particular stage in life. The aims in life were recognised to be four viz., *Dharma* right action, *Artha* economic and political needs, *Kāma* the passions of the physical body and *Mokṣa* final release. *Artha* and *Kāma* are to be subordinated to *Dharma* and all these three to the highest aim namely *Mokṣa*. Attachment to *Artha* and *Kāma* bind the soul to the worldly affairs and therefore, they are not to be given free scope. They have to be curbed in the interests of the soul. These three, when they are not subordinated to the fourth aim, lead the soul to another body after its separation from the body where it has been residing. It is but natural that they should, otherwise justice in the moral government of the world would not be satisfied. This law of transmigration which the Indians believe in is based on the ethical principle that every individual is the 'architect of his own fate'. Like this law, the doctrine of salvation is also recognised according to which every individual can put an end to this law of transmigration through knowledge. It is ignorance that prevents the soul from acting properly. The knowledge of truth will put the soul in the right path. This is gained through philosophical speculation. Ethical discipline, as prescribed by religion, puts an end to this ignorance. Thus the goal namely final release could be obtained 'by work and not by mere faith.' In Indian systems, religion is given more importance than mere philosophical speculation.

The Vedic texts contain the germs which sprouted and grew up into the systems of philosophy. The main truth of these systems is the existence of the Supreme Being. The Vedic texts contain accounts which show that attempts were made to find out the nature of the Supreme Being. These accounts show that the philosophical enquiries began at a very early stage in the period of literature. The speculations, which began about one God, came to deal with plurality of Gods. That is, henotheism resulted from monotheism and then

there was the worship of all the gods a sort of mono-theism when all the gods came to be treated as one god. The *Brāhmaṇas* of the *Vedas* show the development of the religious aspect of life. The *Upaniṣads* contain passages which served as the bases for the development of philosophic literature ; but they do not give anything like a systematic exposition of any doctrine. Each *Upaniṣad* has many doctrines. The *Upaniṣads* have, however, in them the basic structure for a unified and connected development of philosophic thought.

Each system of thought expects from a student wishing to study that system a healthy belief in the old texts on which it is based and in the conclusions arrived at by the pioneers who built that system. There is no system which disowns respect for the ancient texts and the theories of predecessors. In this respect, the development of the system of thought may be compared to the blossoming of a flower which is gradual and in which the petals do not get away from the flower and remain intact with the flower.

The systems of Indian philosophy are condemned as pessimistic by the critics of the West. They seek to support this contention by referring to the place given to *Artha* and *Kāma* in the conduct of one's life, and the glorification of the ascetics and their powers. Their contention, however, is thoroughly unconvincing, for pessimism recognises everything as evil and makes the mind remain gloomy and desperate without allowing any room for hope. The Indian thinkers do not give any prominent place to *Artha* and *Kāma* not merely because they bind the soul, which is already tied down to the world but because a better goal *viz.*, salvation is achieved through undermining *Artha* and *Kāma*. The same motive, a hopeful one, is to be seen in the spirit of renunciation practised by the Indians. Therefore it must be understood that a spirit of optimism pervades through the Indian systems of thought.

The systems of thought are various according to the mode of speculation. Each system is called '*Darśana*' which means spiritual perception of that with which knowledge is gained. The realisation of truth (*tattvadarśana*) is the aim for a system of thought. The systems are broadly divided as *Āstika* and *Nāstika*. The term '*Āstika*' means one having faith in the authority of the *Vedas* and the term '*Nāstika*' one having no faith in them. In the light of this interpretation of these terms, three systems *viz.* the *Cārvāka*, *Buddhism* and *Jainism* are brought under the *Nāstika* fold since they do not believe in the authority of the *Vedas*, and six systems *viz.*, the *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vedānta*, which believe in the authority of the *Vedas*, are brought under the *Āstika* group. To have faith in the authority of the *Vedas* does not mean to possess slavish dependence on the *Vedas*. It permits a system to remain within the fold of the *Āstika*, and have faith in the validity of the *Vedas* but yet try to interpret the Vedic passages in its own way.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE NĀSTIKA SYSTEMS

THE CĀRVĀKA SCHOOL

This school is materialistic in outlook. The doctrines of this school are as old as humanity. Anything, which is beyond the reach of the sense organs, is denied to exist. No means of proof is admitted except perception. The *Vedas* are not valid. There is neither God nor the other world. There is nothing like soul distinct from matter or from the physical body. There is nothing like pleasure apart from the worldly ones. Their motto in life is to be happy at all costs. There is no independent work representing the views of the system. The principles of the system are known from the works of other systems. One Bṛhaspati is cited as the authority on the system.

BUDDHISM

The system of *Buddhism* was founded by Gautama (535-485 B.C.) a prince of Kapilavāṣṭu. He was moved to pity on seeing the sufferings of the people. With a view to find out a means to put an end to the misery of the people, he practiced meditation and became enlightened (*buddha*). After this he came to be called Buddha. He evolved certain principles to end human misery. He did not indulge in speculations. His attitude to the principles of which he has been a follower before he got enlightenment is one of agnosticism.

The principles which he evolved formed the cardinal doctrines of *Buddhism*. Life is full of misery. Sufferings are due to actions which are actuated by desires and passions. By constantly indulging in these actions, an individual continues to suffer and is entangled in the series of births and deaths, since the individual becomes a tool in the hands of the law of *Karma* and the doctrine of transmigration. The passions and desires which are responsible for doing the actions are born out of ignorance. It is only the right knowledge that can put an end to this ignorance. The right knowledge consists in the understanding that there is no soul and that there is no world. The belief that there is soul obstructs the rise of correct knowledge. It gives room for the growth of attachment, desires and passions. Even during transmigration, what migrates is not the soul, since there is none but the character. The world too does not exist. What is

found to exist is not only apparent but of temporary nature. When the right knowledge, which concerns with misery, its cause, its destruction and the cause of its destruction, is produced, ignorance disappears and along with it its products desires and passions. When this is achieved, there will not be any action and consequently no suffering. This absence of suffering could be brought about only by meditation. Meditation brings about finally the absence of suffering which amounts to the non-existence of the world and consequently the non-existence of knowledge. This stage is called '*nirvāṇa*'. The word '*nirvāṇa*' means blowing out, or extinction. It means that during this stage, there is nothing, as everything is annihilated. This proves that the ultimate truth is voidness (*śūnya*)

One who aspires to get '*bodha*' is called a *Bodhisattva*. He may be a householder or a monk. His conduct is marked by the spirit of universal benevolence. A *Bodhisattva* has to pass through many stages before he becomes a Buddha. He must become perfect in the *pāramitas* (transcendent virtues) viz., *dāna* charity, *śīla* observance of moral conduct, *kṣānti* forbearance, *vīrya* energy, *dhyāna* meditation and *prajñā* knowledge. The monk put these into practise in the cloisters while the householder in his daily life by self sacrifice and devotion.

The Buddha did not recognise the *Vedas* as the valid means of knowledge. He did not have faith in the existence of a Supreme Being nor did he care to discuss the questions of creation and destruction of the world. However, he accepted the yogic practises—*bhāvana* (meditation) and laid stress on the practise of *brahmacarya*.

The pupils of the Buddha were of different intellectual calibre. Some among them were not able to compromise the doctrine of voidness (*śūnyatā*) with the world whose existence is felt. The subtle truth and deep philosophy which characterised the preachings of the Buddha were beyond their understanding. As a result of their varied powers of understanding, there arose four schools among the disciples of the Buddha and the followers of his teachings. They are the *Vaibhāṣikas*, *Sautrāntikas*, *Yogācāras* and *Mādhyamikas*. The one doctrine which is peculiar to the system is that every object is momentary in its existence. The first school holds that both knowledge (*jñāna*) and the knowable (*jñeya*) are real. The second school admits the reality of knowledge and seeks to prove the reality of the knowables through inference. The third school believes in the existence of knowledge and denies existence to everything else. Hence it is also called the *Vijñānavādin* school. The last mentioned school denies the existence even of knowledge and believes in voidness. Hence it is also called the school of *Śūnyarāda*. Sanghabhadra, and Kātyāyana were the early writers of the *Vaibhāṣika* school, Kumāralabdha (300 A. D.) of the *Sautrāntika* school which is based

on the original texts, Maitreyanātha and Ārya Asaṅga of the *Yogācāra* school which had *Yoga* (meditation) and *ācāra* (practice), and Ārya Nāgārjuna of the *Mādhyamika* school according to which external objects were neither absolutely real nor unreal and thus avoided the two extremes. About 100 A. D., the leading Buddhists drew the line of distinction in the four schools marking them as of a higher course and of a lower one. The lower course which came to be designated '*Hinayāna*', included the *Vaibhāṣikas* and the *Sautrāntikas*. The adherents of this course were of average ability and sought to get their own salvation. The higher course was designated '*Mahāyāna*'. It comprised the *Yogācāras* and the *Mādhyamikas*. The followers of this course were men of superior calibre who could achieve their salvation without the assistance of another and could work for others' salvation. The followers of the *Hinayāna* used *Pāli* for their literature while those of the *Mahāyāna* used *Sanskṛta*.

The Buddha did not leave any work behind him. His speeches and sayings are found recorded in the *Pitakas* which are in *Pāli* and represent the canons of the Buddhists. These *Pitakas* are three the called the *Sutta*, *Vinaya* and *Abhidhamma*. The *Sutta* contains Buddha's sermons. The *Vinaya* contains the rules of discipline and the precepts for the daily life of the monks and nuns. The *Abhidhamma* deals with the philosophical discussions. The authors of these *Pitakas* are not known and the date of their compositions is placed even before 240 B. C. The canons are available also in *Sanskṛta* but all of them are fragmentary. Some among them are the *Pratimokṣasūtra*, *Vinayapitaka*, *Dirghāgama*, *Madhyamāgama* and others.

There are other texts which are authoritative to the Buddhists. Most of them are in the form of fables. The *Jātakas*, *Dhammapāda*, *Dīpaṇṣī*, the *Avadānas* and others come under this group. The *Mahāvastu* belongs to the *Hinayāna* and it contains a number of *Jātakas*. The *Lalitavistara* is the most sacred text of the *Mahāyāna*. It contains a biography of the Buddha. It is also called *Vaipulya-sūtra*. The date and author of the work are undecided. It was translated into Chinese in the 9th century A. D. Kumāralāta is the author of the *Sūtrālaṅkāra* also called *Kalpānāmaṇḍita* which is a collection of the *Jātakas* and *Avadānas* and is in fragments. Of the same nature is the *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra. The *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* gives the doctrines of the *Mahāyāna* in the form of *sūtras*. The prose passages, which it contains, are given in pure *Sanskṛta* and the *Gāthas* in *Prākṛta*. It was translated into Chinese in 223 A.D. This work has been very helpful in the development of devotion to the Buddha. The *Prajñāpāramitas* deal with the doctrine of nihilism (*śūnyavāda*). They speak about the perfections of a *Bodhisattva*. There are various versions of these each having different number of the *sūtras*. Their number varies from 700 to one lakh. Their names

therefore are *Aṣṭasāhasrikāpāramita*, *Śatasāhasrikāpāramita* and so on. The *Laṅkāvatārasūtras* deal with the doctrines of Buddhistic idealism and nihilism. The *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* gives some magic formulae. The *Samādhirāja* deals with meditation. The ten stages to be gone through by a *Bodhisattva* in order to attain Buddhahood are dealt with in the *Daśabhūmiśvara*. The *Gaṇḍavyūha* and *Tathāgataguhyaka* are also in support of the nihilistic doctrines.

About the beginning of the Christian era, the Buddha was deified. Meditation on God came to be looked upon as the means for release. The goddess worshipped was Mañjuśrī. This topic is dealt with in the *Avalokitesvaragunaṅkarāṇḍavyūha*, *Sukhāvatīyūha*, *Karmapūṇḍarīka* and *Avatamsakasūtra*. The *Ādikarmapradīpa* deals with the rituals of the Buddhists which include magic and mysticism.

The ultimate truth of nihilism is that everything is a void. Till this is realised, the phenomenal world which exists will have to be accounted for as the modification of knowledge (*jñāna*). This is called *ālayavijñāna* the knowledge which exists till the truth is realised. The knowledge which is produced on account of the experiences gained with the aid of the senses is called *pravṛttivijñāna*. To understand these principles, two means of proof viz, perception and inference are recognised by the Buddhists.

The earliest writer to deal systematically with the Buddhist doctrines was Aśvaghoṣa who is remembered as one of the chief persons to found and propagate the *Mahāyāna* principles. To his authorship is attributed the *Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda* a philosophical treatise on the doctrines of the *Mahāyāna*. Nāgārjuna was another philosopher who is believed to have shared the responsibility with Aśvaghoṣa for the founding of the *Mahāyāna*. He was well-versed in the tenets of the Buddhistic philosophy, magic, astronomy, medicine and other branches of learning. He wrote a number of works most of which now remain in Tibetan and Chinese versions. He wrote the *Mādhyamika sūtras*, also called the *Mādhyamikakārikas* 400 in number on the tenets of the *Mahāyāna* with his commentary *Akuto-bhayā*. His other works are the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, *Śūnyatāsaptaṭi*, *Praṭītyasamutpādaḥṛdaya*, *Mahāyānaviṃśika*, *Vigrahavyāvartanī* on logic, *Dharmasangraha*, *Suhṛllekha*, *Pramāṇavidhvaṃsana*, *Pañcaparākrama* on rituals and others. The *Yogācāra* school, which gained distinction after the Christian era, owes its eminence to the efforts of Maitreya who lived before 400 A. D. He is known as the author of the *Bodhisattvacāryānirdeśa*, *Saptadaśabhūmiśāstrayogacaryā* and *Abhisamayālaṅkārikā*. Asaṅga, who lived in the 4th Century A. D., was a pupil of Maitreya. He wrote the *Yogācārabhūmisūtra* and the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkārasūtra* with his own commentary. He wrote ten other works which are available in Chinese and Tibetan. Vasubandhu was the brother of Asaṅga. He was at first a follower of the *Hinayāna* on the principles of which he wrote the *Gāthāsaṅgraha* and *Abhidharmakośa*.

Later he became the follower of the *Mahāyāna* and wrote a number of works whose originals are now lost. The *Vādaividhi*, *Vādamārga*, *Vādakauśala*, *Tarkaśāstra*, *Paramārthasaptati* which is an attack on the *Sāṅkhyakārikas* and other works. Diṇṇāga was a pupil of Vasubandhu. He lived about 400 A. D. He may be styled as the founder of the Buddhistic logic. His works are the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* with his own *vṛtti*, *Nyāyapraveśa*, *Hetucakra*, *Ālambanaparikṣā* with *vṛtti*, *Trikālaparikṣā* and others. With the exception of the *Nyāyapraveśa*, all others have been lost in their originals. Paramārtha (498-569 A. D.) translated a number of works written in *Sanskṛta* into Chinese. Śāntideva in the 7th century A. D. wrote the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Dharmakīrti (c. 650 A. D.) was the great opponent of the *astika* schools of his time. He wrote on Buddhistic logic and philosophy. His works are the *Pramāṇavārtikakārikā* with his own *vṛtti*, *Pramāṇavinīścaya*, *Nyāyabindu*, *Hetubinduvivaraṇa*, *Tarkanyāya*, *Santānāntarasiddhi* and *Sambandhaparikṣā* with his own *vṛtti*. Among these, the *Nyāyabindu* is available in *Sanskṛta* while the rest remain in translations. Śāntarakṣita wrote about 749 A. D. the *Tattvasaṅgraha* in which he criticises the philosophical systems of his day and this work was commented in 770 A. D. in the *Tattvasaṅgrahapañjika*, by Kamalaśīla pupil of Śāntarakṣita. Kalyāṇarakṣita who lived in the first half of the 9th century is known as the author of the *Sarvajñasiddhikārikā*, *Bāhyārthasiddhikārikā*, *Śrutiparikṣā*, *Anyāpohavicāra-kārikā* and *Īśvarabhaṅgakārikā*. To Dharmottara, pupil of Kalyāṇarakṣita, are attributed the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, *Pramāṇaparikṣā*, *Apohanāmaprakaraṇa*, *Paralokasiddhi*, *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi*, and *Pramāṇavinīścayaṭīkā*. The date of Dharmottara may be fixed about 850 A. D. The *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi*, *Apohasiddhi*, *Sthirasiddhidūṣaṇa* and *Citrādvaitasiddhi* are the works of Ratnakīrti who flourished in the first half of the 10th century A. D. The *Kāryakāraṇabhāvasiddhi*, *Vyāptiarcā* and *Pramāṇavārtikāṭīkā* are remembered as the works of Jñānaśrī (c. 950 A. D.).

The main popularity of the system was due to its ethical principles. The success of *Buddhism* as a system was mainly due to the untiring efforts of scholars like Nāgarjuna, Asanga and Vasubandhu, disputants like Diṇṇāga and Dharmakīrti and writers like Kamalaśīla. The ethical principles were not anything peculiar to *Buddhism*. These are to be traced to the Vedic texts. The exclusive nihilistic attitude made the system receive an attack from the followers of the different schools. On account of this, there resulted a set back in the progress of the system in the land of its birth.

JAINISM.

Vardhamāna Mahāvīra (599-527 B. C.) was the founder of *Jainism*. He reformed a creed which existed during his time and

was propounded by Pārśvanātha (800 B. C.). He had twenty-three saints as his predecessors in this sphere, the earliest being Ṛṣabha a saint who was the originator of the doctrines.

The Jains recognise the existence of souls as distinct from matter which is also real. The souls are many in number. The Jains believe in the doctrines of transmigration and *Karma*. The soul has knowledge which is not allowed to shine on account of the past actions. The physical body, which is acquired as a result of the actions, prevents the soul from having progress and hence the body is called 'āvaraṇa'. The means to get rid of this body lies in the 'Ratnatraya' or three gem-like observances viz., *Samyagdarśana*, *Samyajñāna* and *Samyakcāritra*. *Samyagdarśana* consists in having faith in the Jain principles. *Samyajñāna* consists in the understanding the principles as they are taught by the Jain scholars. *Samyakcāritra* consists in abstaining from committing the sins which bind the soul. In order to put *Samyakcāritra* to practise, one has to observe harmlessness (*ahimsā*), cheerful speech (*sūnṛta*), honesty or absence of theft (*asteya*), abstinence (*brahmacarya*) and non-acceptance of anything in the world or abandonment of delusion in the objects (*aparigraha*). The doctrine of *ahimsā* is carried to the point of perfection in practice. One shall rather commit suicide than break his vows. More stress is laid on asceticism. The goal of these observances is the final liberation from mortal bondage. In this state, the soul is eternally and absolutely free from the passions of the world. The causes of misery are completely removed. The soul does not get annihilated as in the case of Buddhism but enters into a blessed state. The souls are designated *arhats* in this state. They are omniscient.

The Jains do not recognise the existence of a Supreme Being nor do they admit the *Vedas* as the sources of knowledge. Perception, inference and verbal testimony (in the form of the writings of the Jain scholars) are the three means of proof recognised by them.

With reference to the existence of the material objects, the Jains have formulated a peculiar theory called *syādvāda*. An object, when it is said to exist, does not exist in the form of those other than itself. Therefore it can be said to exist in one respect and not to exist in some other. It can be spoken by a definite name and cannot be spoken by any other name. Therefore an object may be referred to in more ways than one. Seven modes are adopted by the Jains to express the existence of an object viz., an object is ; it is not ; it is and it is not ; it is indescribable ; it is and yet is indescribable ; it is not and it is also indescribable ; and it is and it is not and it is also indescribable. This kind of referring to an object is also called the *Saptabhāṅgīnaya* from the seven modes of reference.

After the death of Mahāvīra, his followers grouped themselves into two sects called the *Digambara* and *Svetāmbara*. The former group held that one desiring to get salvation, must give up his belongings and even his clothes which are also *āvaranās* and that women were not eligible to get *Mokṣa*. The followers of this group therefore advocated utter nakedness. The *Svetāmbara* groups advocated the wearing of the white robes and did not deny for women the scope to get *Mokṣa*.

The earliest exponents of this system preached the doctrines in the *Māgadhī Prākṛta*. Their writings also were recorded in *Prākṛta*. The *Siddhāntas* or the *Āgamas* are the sacred texts of the Jains. The earliest writer was Bhadrabāhu. There were two Jain writers of this name one older and the other younger. Their periods are respectively given as c. 433-357 B. C., and c. 12 B. C. One of them was responsible for formulating the ten-membered syllogism. He also wrote a *Prākṛta* commentary called *Daśavaikālikaniryukti* on the *Daśavaikālikasūtra* which contains the principles of Jaina logic. The idea of the categories and the method of comprehending them are treated by Umāsvāti in the 1st century A. D. in his *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* on which he himself wrote a commentary. The *Nyāyāvatāra* a commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*, and *Sammatitarkasūtra* on Jain philosophy in *Prākṛta* are attributed to Siddhasena divākara (480-550 A. D.) whom the critics of the West place in the 7th century A. D. The *Gandhastimahābhāṣya* a commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* was written by Samantabhadra whom Kumārila (c. 650 A. D.) criticised. Therefore he must have lived before 600 A. D. The introductory portion of his commentary is called *Āptamīmāṃsa*. To Akalaṅka, whom Kumārila (c. 650 A. D.) criticised, and who must have lived about 600 A. D., are attributed a commentary on the *Āptamīmāṃsa* of Samantabhadra, the *Nyāyaviniścaya*, *Tattvartharārtikaryā-khyānalāṅkāra*, *Laghīyastraya*, *Svarūpasambodhana* and other works. Māṇikyanandin (800 A. D.) is the author of the *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra* on the means of proof (*pramāṇa*). This work has a commentary *Praneyakamalamārtāṇḍa* by Prabhacandra (about 825 A. D.) who also wrote the *Nyāyakumudacandrodaya* a commentary on the *Laghīyastraya* of Akalaṅka. To Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.), are attributed the *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* with his own commentary, and the *Vītarāgastuti* in praise of the *arhat*. Devasūri, a contemporary of Hemacandra, is the author of the *Pramānanayatattvālokālāṅkāra* on which he himself wrote a commentary called the *Syādrādaratnākara*. To Candraprabha (1100 A. D.) are attributed the *Daśanaśuddhi*, and *Prameyaratnakośa*. Haribhadrasūri was the famous scholar of the 12th century A. D. To his authorship are attributed the *Śaḍdarśana-samuccaya*, *Nyāyāvatāravivṛti*, *Yogabindu*, *Dharmabindu* and other works. The Jain tradition tells that he wrote 1400 works. The

Vitaragastuti of Hemacandra was commented in the *Syādrādamañjarī* written by Malliṣeṇa in 1292 A. D. This work gives a systematic exposition of the *syād āda*. Rājaśekharasūri (1348 A. D.) is the author of many works among which the *Syādrādakalikā* and *Pañjikā* the commentary on the *Nyāyakandali* of Śrīdhara are prominent. The *Śaḍdarśanasamuccaya* of Haribhadra was commented by Guṇaratna in the first quarter of the 15th century A. D. Yaśovijaya-gaṇi (1609-1688) A. D wrote more than one hundred works. Among them the well-known are the *Nyāyapradīpa*, *Tarkabhāṣā*, *Nyāyarahasya*, *Nyāyāmṛtatarangiṇī*, and *Nyāyakhaṇḍakhādyā*.

The duties of Jains, laymen and monks, are given in the *Yogabindu* and *Dharmabindu* of Haribhadrāsūri, and in the *Praśnottaropāśakācārā* of Sakalakīrti (1464 A. D.) who also wrote the *Tattvārthasāradīpikā* which contains a full account of the books on the *Digambara* Jainism

Biographical and traditional are the contents of the *Upamiti-bhāvaprapancakathā* of Siddharṣi (906 A. D.), *Dharmaparīkṣā* of Amitagati (1000 A. D.), *Parīṣṭaparcan* and *Sthavirāvalīcarita* of Hemacandra, 1088-1172 A. D.) *Harivamśapurāṇa* on the *Bhārata* story from the Jain stand point, one an earlier version by Jinasena (784 A. D.) and a later one by Sakalakīrti and his pupil Jinadāsa in the 15th Century A. D., *Ādipurāṇa* by Jinasena of the 9th Century A. D., *Uttarapurāṇa* a continuation of the *Ādipurāṇa* by Guṇabhadra (898 A. D.), *Padmapurāṇa* by Raviṣeṇa 660 A. D) and *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* by Subhacandra in 1551 A. D.

Jainism made its progress mainly through the doctrine of *ahimsā*. It lays more importance on the ethical principles of religion than on the speculative side. More than the Buddhists have the Jains contributed to the *Samskr̥ta* literature. Their poems are simple and lucid in style. They have also contributed to the progress of the *Prākṛta* literature.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE ĀSTIKA SYSTEMS NYĀYA, VAISĒSIKA, SĀNKHYA AND YOGA

The Āstika systems are six number. They are the *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Sāṅkhyā*, *Yoga*, *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vedānta*. The cardinal doctrines of all these systems are derived from the Vedic texts and the growth of these systems can be traced back to the period of the *Upaniṣads*. A chronological study of these systems is therefore not possible. The doctrines of these systems are found in the form of *sūtras*. Bādarāyaṇa and Jaimini are the authors of the *sūtras* on the *Vedānta* and *Mīmāṃsā* respectively. Bādarāyaṇa is identified with Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Jaimini is considered to have been the pupil of Vyāsa. Kapila and Patañjali are the authors of the *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga sūtras* respectively. Patañjali is considered to be identical with the grammarian of the same name. Gautama and Kaṇāda are the authors of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika sūtras* respectively.

These systems have their own list of classification of realities (*tattva*) and recognise that final release (*mokṣa*) could be obtained only through the knowledge of the realities. In order to get the knowledge required, they give their own definitions of the valid means of proof (*prāmaṇa*) and recognise a number of *pramāṇas* which ranges from two to eight. Each system has its own list of *pramāṇas*. Each system is called a *Darśana*.

THE NYĀYA-VAISĒSIKA SYSTEMS.

These two systems lay special stress on the science of methodical reasoning which took its origin in the *Upaniṣads* like the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad*. The word *Nyāya* was originally applied to the logical interpretation of the Vedic texts. The *Mīmāṃsā* school was referred to frequently by the word *Nyāya*. It is only later that it came to refer to this system. The word *Vaiśeṣika* refers to a system which recognised for the first time a category called particularity (*viśeṣa*). It is held that on account of some peculiar doctrines, which are recognised in the system, one who has grasped them is called a *vaiśeṣika*¹. The *Vaiśeṣika* system is concerned with metaphysics; and the *Nyāya* is concerned with the epistemology

1. द्वित्वे च पाकजोत्पत्तौ विभागे च विभागजे ।

यस्य न वस्तुविता बुद्धिस्तं वै वैशेषिकं विदुः ॥

of the realities of the world. The latter gives methods to conduct debates on metaphysical problems. It can therefore be called the science of definitions which are to be framed in accurate expressions. Both the systems deal also with the problems of psychology. Both the systems aim at final release (*niṣreyasa*) which consists in the absolute cessation of misery. The knowledge of the *tattvas* is the means to get this goal. Perception and inference are the means of proof recognised by the *Vaiśeṣika* system while they together with verbal testimony and comparison (*Upamana*), are recognised by the *Nyāya* system. The *Vedas* are the highly authoritative texts because they are the compositions of the Supreme Being. Man's relation to God, and the need to worship Him came to be discussed not in the earlier texts but in the post christian era when Udyotakara, Vācaspati miśra and Udayana contributed much to the discussion of these questions. The devotional element in the later works is mainly due to the efforts of Udayana who made a valuable contribution to theism. After Udayana the systems of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* came to be treated as a single system. The epistemological side came to be highly developed in this period. The dialectics of this system became so perfect in this period that this method of treatment came to be adopted by the representatives of the other systems of thought and also of the non-śāstraic subjects like rhetorics.

The *Vaiśeṣikas* were responsible for the formulation of their atomic theory and the *Naiyāyikas* developed it later. According to this theory, an atom represents a sixth part of the smallest particle visible to the naked eye. Every product or substance is produced out of the combinations of these atoms which are many belonging to the various elements and which combine in various ways. The qualities of a product are to be traced to those of the atoms which produced it. The atoms are said to undergo changes on account to internal heat (*pāka*). The *Vaiśeṣika* system holds that whenever heat is applied to an object, that object gets decomposed to the state of atoms, which after having changed in their qualities, form to produce a new object. In this system, the effect of heat takes place in the atom which is called *pīlu*. This view of the system is therefore called *pīlupāka-vāda*. The *Nyāya* system holds that, on application of heat, changes take place imperceptibly in the atoms while the composite whole does not decompose. The effect produced in the atoms is gradually seen in the whole (*pīthara*). This view, which admits the effect of heat both in the atoms and whole, is called the *pītharapāka-vāda*. With reference to created products, this school holds the view that the effect is produced anew. Therefore this view is called *ārambhavāda*.

The *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* are earlier than the *Nyayasūtras* in origin. They are loosely strung together and thus show an early attempt

at systematisation. Written in an archaic style, they contain no reference to *Buddhism*. The date therefore could be placed before 500 B. C. The *Nyayasūtras* treat, in a logical manner, the topics of the *Vaiśeṣika sūtras* after revising them. They appear to defend the views of the *Vaiśeṣika* system from the attacks of the Buddhists and the Jains. The date of the *sūtras* may be fixed after the rise of *Buddhism*, that is about 400 B. C. Kanāda is the author of the *sūtras* of the *Vaiśeṣika* system which was originally called *Yoga* and Gautama of the *sūtras* of the *Nyaya* system which was called *Ārvikṣikī*.

The *Nyāyasūtras* were commented by Vātsyāyana who was also called Pakṣilasvāmin in his *Nyāyabhāṣya*. He is to be placed about 200 A. D. since he refutes the views held by Nāgarjuna and is attacked by Dinnāga (C. 400 A.D). The *Nyāyabhāṣya* was commented by Bhāradvāja Udyotakara in his *Nyāyārartika*. He lived in the 6th Century A. D. Vācaspatimiśra who lived in the 1st half of the 9th Century A. D., commented on the *Nyāyārartika* in his *Nyāyārartikatātparyatīkā*. In 841 A. D., he wrote the *Nyayasūcinibandha* which is an index to the *Nyāyasūtras*.

The *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* were commented by Praśastapāda in his *Padārthadharmanasangraha* familiarly known as the *Praśastapādabhāṣya*. His work is not a regular commentary on the *sūtras*. It is an independent treatise by itself on the *Vaiśeṣika* system. His date is placed about 400 A. D. The *Praśastapādabhāṣya* was commented by four eminent writers viz, Udayana (984 A. D.) in his *Kiraṇavali*, Śrīdhara (991 A. D.) in his *Nyayakandali*, Vallabha (C. 1050 A. D.) in his *Nyayalilavati* and Vyomaśekhara (C. 980) in his *Vyomavati*.

Udayana was the first writer to write both on the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems. Besides his *Kiraṇavali*, he wrote the *Tātparyapariśuddhi* a commentary on the *Nyāyārartikatātparyatīkā* of Vācaspatimiśra, the *Nyayakusumanjali* the best treatise on theism, the *Ātmātattvaviveka* also known as *Bauddhadhikkāra* on the existence of the soul, the *Nyayapariśiṣṭa* which is also called *Bodhasiddhi* on the methods of disputation and the *Lakṣaṇavali* on definitions in the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems. The last mentioned work was written in 984 A. D. His contributions to the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems and to theism in particular have won him the coveted title *Nyāyācārya*.

In 910 A. D., Jayantabhaṭṭa, of Kashmir, also known as the *Vṛttikāra*, wrote the *Nyayamanjari* an independent treatise on the *Nyāya* system and at the same time a commentary on a number of the *Nyāyasūtras*. His *Nyāyakalika* enumerates the categories. In the same century, Bhāsarvajña wrote the *Nyāyasāra* an independent treatise on the *Nyāya*-system. It is curious to find him recognise only three means of proof omitting *Upamāna* from the four means of proof which are recognised by the *Nyāya* school. The *Saptapadarīhi*

of Sivādityamiśra, of the 11th century A. D., is a short manual on the *Vaiśeṣika* system which is treated after the manner adopted in the *Nyāya* system. In the 12th century, was written the *Tārkikarākṣa* by Varadarāja.

About 1150, Gaṅgeśa wrote an independent treatise called the *Tattvacintamani*. The *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems, which were merely concerned with the study of the knowables (*prameya*) with the help of the means of proof (*pramanas*), received a different treatment at the hands of Gaṅgeśa. The principles of the *Vaiśeṣika* system were analysed and examined by adopting the method of the *Nyāya* system. The treatment is based on the *pramanas*. The *Tattvacintamani* is divided into four chapters each dealing with one means of proof. Many are the commentaries and sub-commentaries on the *Tattvacintamani*. Vardhamāna (c. 1200 A. D.), son of Gaṅgeśa, wrote commentaries called *Prakāśa* on the *Tattvacintamani*, *Nyāyalilavati* and the works of Udayana. Jayadeva (c. 1250 A. D.) wrote the *Tattvacintamanyāloka* the commentary on the *Tattvacintamani*. He was given the title Pakṣadharamiśra for his proficiency in the sphere of inference. He was also a dramatist and a rhetorician. Rucidatta (c. 1250 A. D.), pupil of Jayadeva, commented on the *Tattvacintamani* *prakāśa* of Vardhamāna in his *Tattvacintamani* *prakāśamakaranda*. Vāsudeva-sārvabhauma, the greatest logician in the 15th century, was the leader of the *Nyāya* school at Navadvīpa in Bengal. He had four illustrious pupils Raghunāthaśiromaṇi usually styled as Tārkikaśiromaṇi, Raghunandana, the famous lawyer in Bengal, Kṛṣṇānanda a Tāntrika and Caitanya the great Vaiṣṇava teacher. Raghunāthaśiromaṇi's (C. 1500 A. D.) commentaries on the works of his previous writers including the *Tattvacintamani* and its commentaries are called *Didhiti*. The work of Gaṅgeśa and the *Didhiti* were commented by Mathurānātha (C. 1520 A. D.), pupil of Raghunāthaśiromaṇi. Jagadīśa, Gadādhara and Annambhaṭṭa were the eminent logicians of the 17th Century. Jagadīśa (C. 1635 A. D.) commented on the *Didhiti*. Gadādhara's commentaries on the *Didhiti* and the *Tattvacintamani* have become the most famous dialectical treatises on the two systems. Annambhaṭṭa wrote the *Siddhāntajana* a commentary on Jayadeva's *Tattvacintamanyāloka* and the *Subuddhi-manoharā* a commentary on the *Didhiti*.

Besides these commentaries on the *Tattvacintamani* which were written during this period, there were also written independent treatises. Keśavamiśra (1300 A. D.) wrote the *Tarkabhāṣa*. Raghunāthaśiromaṇi (C. 1500 A. D.) wrote the *Padārthakhaṇḍana* on the principles of the *Vaiśeṣika* system. The *Nyayasiddhantamanjari* of Jānakinātha was written in the 16th century on the tenets of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems. There were a number of writers in the 17th century to contribute basic treatises on the two systems. Śaṅkaramiśra, who wrote the *Upaskāra* a commentary

on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras*, wrote the *Kaṇadarahasya* on the principles of the *Vaiśeṣika* system. In 1634, Viśvanāthanyāyapañcānana composed the *Kārikavali* which is also called *Bhāṣāpariccheda* a manual in verse on the *Nyaya-Vaiśeṣika* systems. He himself wrote on it a commentary called the *Siddhantamukhavalī*. He wrote also a commentary on the *Nyayasūtras*. Jagadīśa (C. 1635 A. D.), who commented on the *Didhiti*, wrote the *Sabdasaktiprakāśika* on semantics, the *Tarkamṛta* on the principles of the *Nyaya-Vaiśeṣika* systems and the *Bhasyasūktī* a commentary on the *Prasastapāda-bhasya*. About the same period Laugākṣi Bhāskara wrote a manual *Tarkakaumudī*. Gadādhara commented on the *Ātmatattvaviveka* of Udayana and wrote two independent treatises the *Vyutpattivada* and *Śūktivada* on semantics. Annambhaṭṭa's (C. 1700 A. D.) *Tarkasangraha* together with his *Tarkasangrahadīpikā* a commentary on it has become a very popular book at the hands of the beginners who study the *Nyaya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems.

SĀNKHYA

The germs of this system are to be traced to the Vedic period. The word *sāṅkhya* is found used in the early texts like the *Bhagavadgītā* in the sense of knowledge. The name of the sage Kapila is associated with the origin of the system.

The system prescribes the knowledge of the manifested (*vyakta*), unmanifested (*avyakta*) and knower (*jñā*) as the means to put an end to the worldly miseries. Perception, inference and verbal testimony are the means of proof recognised in this system. The path of the rituals is not favoured by this system. Matter (*Prakṛti*) and soul are two eternal and separate entities in the world. Matter has three attributes called *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* which are in a state of equilibrium. When this equipoise is tilted, creation sets in within the matter which produces *Mahat* or *Buddhi* intellect which in its turn produces *Ahankāra* ego. From ego, ten organs of sense and action, mind and five subtle elements in their subtle forms (*tanmatra*) are produced. The gross elements are produced from the subtle elements. Every gross element has half of it shared by itself and the other half shared equally by other four elements. This system of formation is called *pañcikarāṇa*. The cognition of an object is produced in the intellect and is known with the help of the ego and the mind. The nature of the functions of the intellect, ego and mind is decided by the influence of the three attributes of the matter. When creation sets in, only a part of the matter undergoes change. The matter is called *avyakta* and the twenty-three modifications of matter are called *vyakta*. The soul is the knower (*jñā*). It looks into the *buddhi* which behaves like a mirror and mistakes the impressions created there, as a result of the cognition produced there, as belonging to itself. Owing to the errone-

ous identification, the soul suffers. When the faultless knowledge of the *vyakta*, *avyakta* and *jna* is got, the soul is in its absolute state. The soul is neither bound nor released but is ever free. One great defect in the system is that no explanation is offered by it for the tilting of the equilibrium of the three attributes. The soul and matter are ever there. It is not made clear how creation sets in.

Regarding the products (*Karya*), the system holds that the effect exists in the cause in a latent form. The cause exhibits itself as the effect. The former view is called the *Satkaryavada* and the later the *Parinamavada*.

The system does not believe in the existence of God and does not attach prominence to the validity of the *Vedas*. From the *Mahabhartā*, which contains an account of the *Sāṅkhya* doctrines, it appears that the *Sāṅkhya* system was originally theistic. Probably owing to the influence of *Buddhism*, the system became atheistic as it is taught by *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*. Pessimistic outlook, denial of the existence of God, and failure to respect the Vedic authority, are common to both. It is also possible to hold that the theistic *Sāṅkhya* influenced the development of *Buddhism*.

Kapila, the expounder of the principles of the system, taught them to Āsuri who is said to have lived before 600 B. C. Āsuri communicated them to Pañcaśikha. *Vārsaganya* was the next exponent of the system. The work called *Śaṣṭitantra* which is now lost is attributed to his authorship. The *Tattvasamāsa* of unknown authorship is considered as the earliest basic text on the system. *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* (C. 250 A. D.) summarised the views of the earlier writers in 72 memorable verses called the *Sāṅkhyakarikas*. His identity with Vindhyāvāsa is not established beyond dispute. His *Karikas* are held authoritative by later writers. They were commented in the *Mātharavṛtti* of unknown authorship, in the *Bhāṣya* of Gauḍapāda whose identity is not established and in the *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* of Vacaspatimisra (c. 850 A. D.). Besides these *Karikas*, there are the *Sāṅkhyasūtras* which are attributed to Kapila. They were not treated as authoritative before 1300 A. D. Before this date, the *sūtras* were not available in a systematic form. These *sūtras* which were also called the *Sāṅkhyapravācanasūtras* were commented in the *Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti* by Aniruddha in the 15th century A. D., and in the *Sāṅkhyapravācanabhāṣya* by Vijñānabhikṣu (C. 1550 A. D.) who also wrote the *Sāṅkhyasāra* a manual on the principles of the *Sāṅkhya* system.

YOGA

The *Yoga* system, accepting the principles of *Sāṅkhya*, improves upon them. Finding the mere knowledge of the *vyakta*, *avyakta* *jna* could not bring about final release, this system lays down rules for practical life based on the *Sāṅkhya* principles. Control over the

activities of the *buddhi* is necessary to get rid of the influence of matter and its modifications. This is technically called *Yoga*¹. The system gives in detail the methods of this control. The ultimate goal is absolute existence (*Kaivalya*) of the soul. Control over the functions of the internal organs *buddhi*, *ahankara* and *manas* is very hard to contemplate and extremely difficult to practise. The process of meditation may be interfered with by obstacles over which the soul, performing meditation, will have no control. Meditation on God is suggested as a means to avoid these obstacles and get success in one's undertaking. God is omniscient and helps those who seek His protection. He is not the creator of the world in this system. Eight stages or steps are prescribed to be gone through if one is eager to get control over the functions of the *buddhi*. They are *yama*, *niyama*, *āsana*, *prāṇāyama*, *pratyāhara*, *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna* and *samādhi*. These represent respectively self-restraint, observance, posture, regulation of breath, withdrawal of the senses, steadying the mind, contemplation and meditative trance. The methods of control, prescribed in this system, recognise the different levels of fitness of the practicers of *Yoga*. The object of *Yoga* is to teach a way to self-knowledge. Vice is said to be overcome not by repression but by the practise of the virtues contrary to it. Even if God is meditated upon, the ultimate goal is to have control over the activities of the mind. It is also shown that by having absolute control over the mind, it would be possible for one to do and get whatever one wants. Since this system recognises the existence of the Supreme Being in addition to the principles recognised in the *Sāṅkhya* system, it is called *Sesvarasāṅkhya* as opposed to the *Sāṅkhya* system which is *Nirīṣvara*.

The earliest text on the system is the *Yogasutra* of Patañjali who is identified with the grammarian of this name. The critics of the West doubt this identification. The reference to the doctrine of *Sphoṭa* in the *Yogasutras*² proves that the identification is justifiable. The date of the *Yogasutras* is therefore to be placed in 150 B. C. The *sutras* have four divisions called *Samādhi*, *Sādhana*, *Vibhūti* and *Kaivalya*. The *Yogasutras* were commented by (1) one Vyāsa who lived in the 4th century A. D., in his *Yogasutrabhasya* which was commented by Vācaspatimiśra (850 A. D.) in the *Tattvavaiśaradi*, (2) Bhoja, King of Dhārā (1005-1054 A. D.) in the *Rājamārtanḍa*, and (3) Vijñānabhikṣu (c. 1550 A. D.) who commented on the *Sāṅkhyasutras*, in the *Pāṭanjalaḥbhāṣyavārtika*. He wrote also the *Yogasarasangraha* on the essential principles of the *yoga* system.

The yogic practices are divided into two groups called the *Rājayoga* which deals with the concentration of the mind and the

1. योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधः 1 *Yogasutra* I. 1.

2. *Yogasūtra* III. 17.

Hathayoga which is concerned with the practices to rid the body of all impurities which hinder the process of *Rājayoga*. The latter type of *yoga* is dealt with in the *Hathayogapradīpikā* of Svātmārāma-yogindra. Posture (*āsana*) is given importance in achieving the goal namely perfection in the technique of bodily control. The practices, according to this system, are associated with gross material ends. Other texts on the system are the *Gorakṣasataka*, *Gheraṇḍa-saṁhitā* and others.

The doctrines of *pañcīkaraṇa*, *satkāryavāda*, and *pariṇāmavāda*, the value of the three attributes *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* in their position influencing the mind and soul, the special treatment given to soul and matter as distinct from each other and the importance given to the *Yogāṅgas* as invaluable aids in making progress in practical life are the important contributions made to the world of knowledge by the *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* systems. The *Yoga* system admits the validity of the *Vedas*. The nature of God is one of benefactor and guide. The exact cause of the creative efficiency of matter is left obscure without being solved. The ultimate goal is self realisation and isolation and has nothing to do with the Supreme Being.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

ĀSTIKA SYSTEMS – MIMĀMSĀ

The *Mīmāṃsā* system is concerned with the interpretation of the *Vedas*. The Vedic passages are divided into two groups viz., *Karmakāṇḍa* and *Jñānakāṇḍa*, the former comprising the *Samhitas*, *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas* and the latter the *Upaniṣads*. The system of *Mīmāṃsā* concerns itself with the *Karmakāṇḍa* portion of the *Vedas* and therefore is also called the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā*. The *Vedānta* system which is based on the *jñānakāṇḍa* portion is called the *Uttaramīmāṃsā*, the word *Uttara* referring to the latter portion of the *Vedas* viz., the *Upaniṣads*.

The *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* is based on the *Brāhmaṇa* portion of the Vedic texts. It has framed rules of interpretation and certain principles (*nyāyas*). These rules are found very useful and have been utilised by the system of *Vedānta*, and also by those who attempt to interpret any difficult passage even secular ones. This system is more practical than speculative. Religion plays here a larger part than philosophy. While the other systems of philosophy attempt to help the soul to leave this world for ever, this system preaches to the man his rights and duties in life.

This system recognises the *Vedas* as eternal and authoritative in themselves. The *Vedas* are not the compositions of any one, not even of God. The leading exponents of this system particularly in the early period, laid much stress on the validity of the *Vedas* in their attempt to defend the Vedic religion from the attacks of the Buddhists and Jains. That the world is never changing, there is no heaven apart from this world, that the gods have no bodies and other notions began to characterise the literature of this system during this period. In the latter period, theism was given treatment in this system. The rites enjoined in the *Vedas* have to be performed. They are *Nitya* obligatory, *Naimittika* occasional and *Kāmya* optional. The performance of a rite leaves impressions in the soul. The correct performance of a rite as also the failure to perform it have their own award on the soul. Every obligatory act is to be performed, otherwise it would bring in the sin of omission (*pratyavāya*). Its performance makes the soul purified. The other two kinds of rites are to be performed according as the occasion demands or as the desire of the performer is.

The means of proof (*pramāṇa*) are recognised as six by the *Bhātṭa* school, one of the two schools of *Mīmāṃsā* and five by the other the *Prābhākara* school. The latter school recognises

perception, inference, comparison, verbal testimony, and presumption (*arthāpatti*) and the former admits six by adding non-perception (*anupalabdhi*) as the sixth to this list.

Jaimini is the author of the *sūtras* on *Mīmāṃsā* in twelve chapters. They could be assigned to the 4th Century B. C. They contain more than 1000 sections each having its own maxim of interpretation (*nyāya*). These *nyāyas* form the basis of good and reliable principles of exegesis. On these *sūtras*, Upavarṣa who was called Bodhāyana wrote the *Ṛtti* which is now lost. The *Mīmāṃsā sūtras* were commented by Sabarasvamin (C. 200 A. D.) in his *Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya*. Upavarṣa, Bhartṛmitra, Bhavadāsa, Hari and others are mentioned by him as the commentators on the *sūtras* before him. It is Upavarṣa, Sabarasvamin and others that included the philosophical topics within the province of the *Mīmāṃsā* system for discussions.

The *Bhāṣya* of Śabara was commented by Kumārilaṭṭha (600-660 A. D.) and Prabhākara (610-690 A. D.). According to tradition the latter is considered as the pupil of the former and to have founded a new school of *Mīmāṃsā* called after his name to present his views which were different from those of his preceptor. He was conferred the title Guru owing to the superior skill which he possessed in interpreting the *Vedas*. Thus the school of Kumārila came to be called the *Bhāṭṭamata* and that of Prabhākara the *Gurumata*. The presence of the impressions produced by the deeds of an individual brings in worldly bondage. Final release in these two schools is the condition when the soul has no impressions. *Dharma* and *Adharma* denote the good and bad results of the actions in the *Bhāṭṭa* school and the good and bad actions in the *Prabhākara* school. Besides these two schools, there arose a third school called the school of Murāri, who, commented on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara following the method of Kumārila and slightly differing from him.

Kumārila's commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara is of three parts viz, *Ślokaṭīkā* a versified comment on the first quarter of the first chapter of *Jaimini's sūtras*, *Tantravārtika* in prose and verse on the portion from the second quarter of the first chapter up to the end of the third chapter and *Tuṭīkā* on the remaining portion. From the quotations cited in the works of the later writers, it is understood that Kumārila wrote a *Brhatīkā* a commentary on the *Mīmāṃsā sūtras*. Prabhākara's commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara is of two parts viz, *Brhatī* which is also called *Nibandha*, and *Laghu* also called *Vivarana*. Murārimisra's (C. 1200 A. D.) commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara is called *Tripādanītinayana*. His independent treatise is the *Āṅgatvanirukti*.

Maṇḍanamisra (615-695 A. D.) who was a contemporary of Kumārila, was a great *Mīmāṃsaka* and *Vedantin*. Confusing

accounts are given regarding his identity, his connections with Bhaṭṭa Umveka, Viśvarūpa, and Sureśvara all these three being identified with him and his relationship to Śaṅkarācārya. He wrote on *Mīmāṃsā*, three works *Vidhiviveka*, *Bhāvanāviveka* and *Mīmāṃsānukramaṇikā*. Vācaspatimiśra, who wrote on *Nyāya*, *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, wrote the *Nyāyakaṇikā* a commentary on the *Vidhiviveka*. Vācaspatimiśra followed the views of Maṇḍanamīśra whenever he had to deal with the problems connected with the *Mīmāṃsā* system.

The *Śloka-vārtika* of Kumārila was commented in (1) *Tātparyā-dīpikā* by Bhaṭṭa Umveka (640-725 A. D.) (2) *Kāśikā* by Sucarita miśra (1000-1100 A. D.) and (3) *Nyāyaratnākara* by Parthasarathimīśra (1050-1120 A. D.). The scholars are divided in their opinion regarding the identity of Bhavabhūti and Umveka. The *Tantra-vārtika* was commented by (1) Somesvara (C. 1200 A. D.) in his *Nyāyasudhā* which is also called *Rāṇaka* (2) Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (C. 1600 A. D.), the author of the *Nārāyaṇīya*, in the *Nibandhana* and (3) Annambhaṭṭa (C. 1700 A. D.) in the *Subodhini*. The *Nyāyasudhā* was commented by Annambhaṭṭa (c. 1700 A. D.) in the *Rāṇakojjivanī*. The *Tuṭṭikā* was commented in (1) the *Tantra-ratna* by Pārthasārathimīśra (1050-1120 A. D.) and (2) the *Vārtikābharana* by Veṅkaṭamakṣin also called Veṅkaṭadīkṣita son of Govindadīkṣita (C. 1600 A. D.).

Vācaspatimiśra (C. 850 A. D.) contributed much to the field of *Mīmāṃsā* by writing an independent treatise called *Tattvabindu*. Besides his commentaries on the *Śloka-vārtika* and *Tuṭṭikā* of Kumārila, Pārthasārathimīśra (1050-1120 A. D.) wrote the *Śāstra-dīpikā* an independent treatise exhaustive and comprehensive on the *Mīmāṃsā* system in the light of Kumārila's views and the *Nyāyaratnamālā* a very useful work containing the differences between the *Bhāṭṭa* school and the *Prabhākara* school on the important issues of the *Mīmāṃsā* system. On the *Śāstra-dīpikā* were written the commentaries (1) *Mayūkhamālikā* by Somanātha, (2) *Mayukhā-valī* by Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A. D.) (3) *Prakāśa* by Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa (C. 1600 A. D.) (4) *Āloka* by Kamalākarabhaṭṭa (C. 1612 A. D.) the author of the *Nirṇayasindhu* and (5) *Karpūravartikā* by Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita (C. 1620 A. D.). The *Nyāyaratnamālā* was commented in the *Nāyakarātna* by Rāmānujācārya (c. 1750 A. D.) Somesvara (c. 1200 A. D.) the author of the *Nyāyasudhā* wrote an independent treatise called *Tantrasāra*.

The earliest writer to comment on the works of Prabhākara was Śālikanātha (650-730 A. D.). He wrote (1) the *Rjuvimala-pañcikā* a commentary on the *Nibandha* of Prabhākara and (2) the *Dīpasikhāpancikā* which is probably a commentary on the *Vivaraṇa* of Prabhākara. Besides these two works, he wrote the *Mīmāṃsāsutrabhāsyaparīṣiṣṭa* an annotation to the *Bhāṣya* of

Sabarasvāmin, and the *Prakaraṇapañcikā* a popular manual on the *Prabhākara* school of *Mīmāṃsā*. The *Bhāṣyadīpa* is a commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabarasvāmin by Kṣīrasamudravāsīmīśra probably a follower of the school of *Prabhākara*. The *Nayaviveka* of Bhavanātha (1050-1150 A. D.) explains the various sections (*adhikaraṇas*) in the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* in the light of the views of *Prabhākara*.

Mādhava (1297-1386 A. D.), the elder brother of Śāyana of Vijayanagar, composed the *Jaiminiyanyāyamālā* in verse with his own commentary in prose. This work gives an exposition of the *Mīmāṃsā* system. Appayadīkṣita (c. 1600 A. D.) wrote the *Vidhirasāyana* with his own commentary *Sukhopajīvanī*, *Citrapata*, *Tantrasiddhāntadīpikā* an incomplete commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*, *Upakramaparākrama*, *Vādanakṣatramālā* and others. The principles of *Mīmāṃsā* are found treated in the *Tantrasiddhānta* by Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita (C. 1630 A. D.) who refers in this work to Appayadīkṣita as his preceptor. The *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* were commented in the *Tantrasikhāmaṇi* by Rājacudāmaṇidīkṣita (C. 1620 A. D.) who wrote also the *Śaṅkarṣamuktāvali*. The *Nyāyapadma*, *Mīmāṃsāmakaranda* and *Vidhitrayaparitrāṇa* are the three works of Veṅkaṭādhvarin (C. 1650 A. D.), the author of the *Viśvagunādarśa*. About the same period, Viśveśvarasūri who was also called Gāgābhaṭṭa wrote the *Bhaṭṭacintāmaṇi*. Āpadeva, who died in 1665 A. D., wrote the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa* a popular manual on the *Mīmāṃsā* system. Of similar value is the *Arthasaṅgraha* written by Laugākṣi Bhāskara the author of the *Tarkakaumudī*. Khaṇḍadeva, who was a contemporary of Āpadeva, wrote four important works which have a theistic tinge. They are the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*, *Bhāṭṭarahasya*, *Phalaikatvavāda* and *Mīmāṃsākaustubha*. The last mentioned work deals with the explanation of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*. Annambhaṭṭa (C. 1700 A. D.) wrote the *Rāṇakabhāvanākārikāvivaraṇa* giving an exposition of the memorable verses included in the *Rāṇaka* of Someśvara. The *Tantrarahasya* is a running commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* according to the views of *Prabhākara* by Rāmānujācārya (c. 1750 A. D.) who commented on the *Nyāyaratnamālā* of Pārthasārathimīśra. It is in five chapters and incomplete. The *Mīmāṃsā sūtras* were commented in the *Adhvaramīmāṃsākutūhalavṛtti* by Vāsudevādhvarin (C. 1750 A. D.) the author of the *Bālaṃanoramā* on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. A lucid exposition of the *Bhaṭṭa* school is given in the *Bhāṭṭasāra* by Kṛṣṇatātācārya of the last century.

CHAPTER XXXV. THE ĀSTIKA SYSTEMS AND RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS

Vedānta.

The *Vedānta* system is based on the *Upaniṣads* which represent the latter portion of the *Vedas* or their *jñānakāṇḍa* portion. Hence this is called as *Vedānta* or *Uttaramīmāṃsā*. This system discusses the nature of God in relationship to the world and the individual souls. Therefore this system is also called the *Brahmamīmāṃsā* the Supreme Being denoted by the word Brahman.

The passages in the *Upaniṣads* are manifold. Some of them speak of the souls, Supreme Being and matter and draw their distinctive features and these are called *bhedaśruti*. Some speak of the identity of the many things which appear to be different from each other and these are called *abhedaśruti*. There are some others called *ghaṭakaśruti* which seek to establish a relation between the *bhedaśruti* and the *abhedaśruti*. Thus the *Upaniṣads* do not contain any thing like a systematic exposition of a single doctrine. There are more than one system of *Vedānta* each based on the teachings of the *Upaniṣads*.

The main principles of this system are expounded in the *Vedānta-sūtras* also called the *Brahmasūtras* in four chapters. Tradition tells that there were in existence the *sūtras* of *San̄karṣaṇakāṇḍa* in four chapters. They were in continuation of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* and were followed by the *Brahmasūtras*. This *San̄karṣaṇakāṇḍa* dealt with the deities who are to be worshipped by means of the rites enjoined and dealt with in the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*. These *sūtras* which were composed by Jaimini are now lost. The *Brahmasūtras* are attributed to the authorship of Bādarāyaṇa. Some scholars identify him with Vyāsa son of Parāśara while others are opposed to this identity. The date of the *sūtras* is placed in 500 B. C. It has four chapters or *adhyāyas* called (1) *Samanvaya* according to which the *Upaniṣads* prove the nature of the Brahman, (2) *Avirodha* refuting the views of the other schools of thought (3) *Sādhana* dealing with the means to get *mokṣa* and (4) *Phala* stating the results achieved these means.

The schools of *Vedānta* are also based on the *Bhagavadgītā*. This work deals with God, His multifarious aspects, relation of God to man, modes of worshipping Him, matter and its study in relation to man and God and the means through which a soul can become perfect and happy. Knowledge (*jñāna*), deeds (*karma*) and devotion (*bhakti*) are the three courses to be pursued by a soul to

make progress and to reach the final goal (*Mokṣa*). According to the first course, knowledge of reality (*tattvajñāna*), when acquired, would rid the soul of the effects of the past deeds and enable the soul to get *Mokṣa*. According to the second, one can get *Mokṣa* by doing one's duties without any attachment to the action or its result. The third course makes the soul get it by undivided devotion to the Supreme Being. The *Bhagavadgītā* strongly recommends to the soul the doctrine of self-surrender to the Supreme Being. It can be treated as the best classic on theism which India ever produced. The main object of this work is to teach that a man should do the duty imposed on him fearless of consequences.

The basic texts on which each school of *Vedānta* is based are the *Upaniṣads*, the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgītā*. Almost all the schools have commentaries on all these texts written to represent their views. Every school seeks to support its doctrines and the lines of interpretation by citing lines from the epics *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* and to some extent the *Purāṇas*. Some of the systems of philosophy and of religion base their authority on the *Āgamas* in addition to these three texts and some are based mainly on the *Āgamas*.

The *Āgamas*, which are also known as *Tantras* in some cases, prescribe the mode of worshipping a particular deity and a way of life in conformity with the nature of that worship. They must have taken their rise as a result of the influence of the *Brāhmaṇa* portions of the *Vedas* exercised on those men who preferred the *Bhakti* course to that of *Karma*. Some of the *Āgamas* should have taken their rise long before the *Mahābhārata* was written where a reference is made to the *Āgamas*. The principles of life and modes of worship prescribed in these, run counter to those established by Vedic tradition in some cases and agree with them in others. Some of the *Āgamas* are designated *Samhitas* thus showing their connection with the Vedic texts. They deal in general with *jñāna* (knowledge) *yoga* (concentration on one object) *kriyā* (action) and *caryā* (daily rites). All the *Āgamas* admit that the world is real, and consists of the Supreme Being, individual souls and material objects. The Supreme Deity is the lord of the worlds. The *Āgamas* are of three types according to the deities worshipped. Thus there are *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas*, *Śaiva Āgamas* and *Śākta Āgamas*.

The *Brahmasūtras* were commented by Bodhāyana who was also called Upavarṣa who wrote a *vṛtti* on them called *Kṛtakoti*. He was the same as the author of the *vṛtti* on the *sūtras* of Jaimini. He must have lived in the pre-Christian era. Brahmanandin who was also known as Taṭka wrote the *Vākya* a commentary on the *Chāndogyaopaniṣad*. The *Vākya* was commented in a *Bhāṣya* by Dramiḍācārya. All these writers lived long before Śaṅkara (632-

664 A. D.). Their works are lost and remembered only through the citations from them in the works of later writers.

The main schools of *Vedānta* are *Dvaita*, *Advaita*, *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, and *Suddhādvaita*. The minor schools are those of Nimbārka, Bhāskara, Yādavaprakāsa, and Caitanya and *Śivādvaita*.

DVAITA

This system is based on the *bhedaśruti* of the *Upaniṣads*. The *abheda* and *ghaṭakaśrutis* are interpreted in a manner to lend support to the main doctrine of dualism (*dvaita*). Matter (*prakṛti*), souls (*jīvātman*) and God (*Paramātmān*) are eternal and are different from each other. There is difference also within matter and among the souls. The Supreme Being is Viṣṇu whose body is not made up of matter (*aprākṛta*). He is omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent. At His will, matter changes into world. Among the souls, Lakṣmī is at the head. She is the only soul having permanent existence as the wife of Viṣṇu. Other souls are in bondage. The souls are atomic in size. They are of two groups viz, male and female which distinction continues to exist even in the released state (*Mokṣa*). The relationship between God and souls is that of a master and servant. Every soul has to render service to the Supreme Being Viṣṇu according to the accepted principles and thus get the favour of the Supreme Being. Among the courses prescribed in the *Bhagavadgītā*, the course of *Bhakti* is adopted by the followers of this school. Three means of proof (*pramāṇas*) are recognised in this school viz, perception, inference and verbal testimony. The *Vedas* are eternal and authoritative in themselves. The *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* are recognised as authoritative texts. Of great authority are the *Purāṇas*.

The founder of this school was Ānandatīrtha. His original name was Vāsudeva. His spiritual teacher was Acyutaprekṣācārya. He attacked the *Advaita* doctrine and established the *Dvaita* system. His pupils were Padmanābhatīrtha, Naraharīrtha, Mādhvatīrtha and Akṣobhyatīrtha. He said to have lived from 1119-1198 A. D. This appears to be incorrect, the correct period being 1199-1277 A. D.¹ Ānandatīrtha was his name in his stage of ascetic. His titles were Pūrṇaprajña, Madhyamandāra and Mādhva. It is held that he wrote nearly thirty-seven works mostly to support his standpoint of dualism. Among them, there are commentaries on the important *Upaniṣads*. He wrote the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, the *Brahmasūtrānubhāṣya* a brief

1. Collected Works of R. G. Bhandarkar Vol. IV. P. 83.

commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Brahmasūtrānūvyākhyāna* usually called *Anūvyākhyāna* which explains the difficult *sūtras*. He wrote a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* called *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* and in his *Bhagavadgītātātparyanirṇaya*, he expounded the real purport of the teachings of the *Bhagavadgītā*. Prominent among his other works are the *Rṅbhāṣya*, *Tattvaviveka*, *Tattvasaṅkhyāna*, *Tattvodyota*, *Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍana*, *Pramāṇalakṣaṇa*, *Mahābhāratatātparyanirṇaya*, *Bhāgavatavyākhyā* a commentary on the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, and *Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya*.

Next to Madhva in the school of *Dvaita*, comes Jayatīrtha, the pupil of Akṣobhyatīrtha. He is placed in the second half of the 14th century A. D. He commented on almost all the works of Madhva. But for his valuable comments, the *Dvaita* system would have lost its place among the systems of philosophy. Prominent among his commentaries on the works of Madhva are the *Nyāyasudhā* on the *Brahmasūtrānūvyākhyāna*, *Pañcikā* on the *Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍana*, *Tattvapraśāṅgikā* on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* and *Prameyadīpikā* on the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*. To his credit, he has two independent works *Pramāṇapaddhati* and *Vādāvalī*. The latter work is an adverse criticism of the *Advaitin's* doctrine of *māyā*.

The next great writer was Vyāsayati (c. 1300 A.D.) who wrote an independent work *Nyāyamṛta* criticising the views of Citsukha expressed in his *Tattvadīpikā*. The *Nyāyamṛta* was criticised by Madhusūdanasarasvatī in his *Advaitasiddhi* which was in its turn criticised by Rāmatīrtha in his *Taraṅgiṇī*. Vyāsayati wrote also commentaries on the works of his predecessors. His *Bhāva-praśāṅgikā* was written on the *Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍanapāncikā* of Jayatīrtha. His *Tātparyacandrika* is the commentary on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyatattvapraśāṅgikā* of Jayatīrtha. Rāghavendrayati wrote valuable commentaries on the works of Jayatīrtha and others. His *Bhāvadīpika* is a commentary on the *Tattvapraśāṅgikā* of Jayatīrtha and *Parimala* on the *Nyāyasudhā* of the same author. He himself wrote the *Gītarthasaṅgraha* a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā*. The *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Madhva was commented by him in the *Tantradīpikā*. His *Nyāyamuktāvalī* is an independent treatise on the *Dvaita* school. Vādirāja, Vijayīndra and Śrīnivāsātīrtha are other great writers who have contributed much to the development of the literature of the *Dvaita* school.

ADVAITA

According to this school, the Brahman alone exists. The world which appears to exist does not really exist. If it has existence, it would have existed in the past and would exist in the future. What is produced at a particular time and destroyed at another cannot be said to have existence. The world is changing and it has a begin-

ning and an end. Like mirage, it appears to exist. This apparent existence is due to the *māyā* which has been screening the Brahman from time immemorial. This *Māyā* is of the nature of the three qualities *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. *Māyā* can be said neither to exist nor not to exist. It defies description. It is also unreal because it is said to be destroyed. It is called by other terms *ajñāna*, *avidyā* and *moha*. It has two aspects. In one, the *sattva* portion predominates and in the other it is of secondary importance. It is called *māyā* in its former aspect and *Avidyā* in the latter. The Brahman is reflected in the *māyā* and appears like the world. In its aspect of having the *sattva* in a predominant portion, the reflected image of the Brahman is called *Īśvara* and in the latter aspect, the reflected images are called the souls and the world. Therefore the same Brahman appears like the gods, souls and world. It is also held that the reflections of the Brahman in the *antaḥkāraṇa* which is a product of the *māyā* are called individual souls. The *antaḥkāraṇa*, the modifications of the *māyā*, being many, there is plurality of souls.

Owing to this screen of *māyā*, the Brahman's real nature is not understood and therefore the world is found to exist. The Brahman is existent, conscious and is bliss itself. Existence, consciousness and bliss are not the attributes of the Brahman. They are identical with it. The Brahman has no quality. It is *nirguṇa*.

This school admits the reality of the world till this truth of monism is realised. The souls therefore exist as the reflections of the Brahman in the *antaḥkāraṇa* and therefore endowed with few qualities. Gods also exist as the reflections of the Brahman in the *māyā* and therefore endowed with many qualities. Hence the souls are required to worship the Gods. Through this worship and the doing of obligatory rites (*nitya karma*) without expecting any reward in return, a soul gets the *citta* or *antaḥkāraṇa* purified from all the effects of the *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. Then it becomes *nirguṇa* or is no longer under the effects of the *māyā*. What exists then is the Brahman free from *māyā* and not the soul which has been only the reflection of the Brahman in the *āvidyā* or *antaḥkāraṇa*. Thus there is identity established between the soul and the Brahman and this is the truth (*tattva*) taught in the *Upanisads*. On account of this identity, this school came to be called *Advaita*. This experience of identity could be had during one's life-time and this stage is called *Jīvanmukti* and the final release, which takes place after the separation of the soul from the physical body, is called *Videhamukti*. The state of realisation is called the real stage *pārāmārthika* and the previous stage is called *vyāvahārika*. During this latter stage, the rules and disciplines laid down by the *Dharmaśāstras* and *Mīmāṃsā* are binding on the soul. In this stage, this school adopts the views of the *Bhāṭṭa* school of *Mīmāṃsā* and recognises all the six means

of proof recognised by the latter school. Among the courses prescribed, the path of knowledge is to be pursued to get the final release. On account of this doctrine of *māyā*, this school holds the *vivartavāda* about the world.

Among the early writers of this school, Bhartṛprapañca and Gauḍapāda are mentioned as authorities. No work of the former has come down. Gauḍapāda (520-620 A. D.) is considered to have been the preceptor of Govindabhagavatpāda (560-650 A. D.), the guru of Śaṅkarācārya. He is the author of the *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* in which he gives an exposition of the contents of the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*.

Maṇḍanamisra (615-695 A. D.), a contemporary of Kumārila-bhaṭṭa and a Mīmāṃsaka was also a Vedāntin. He wrote three important works on the system of *Vedānta*. They are (1) *Brahmasiddhi* (2) *Sphoṭasiddhi* and (3) *Vibhramaviveka*. In the first work, he gives a clear exposition of the *Vedānta* system from the stand point of the *Advaita* school. In the second work, he upholds the *Śabdādvaita* advocated by Bhartṛhari. The last work is on epistemology. His views on Advaita are quoted with respect by Vācaspatimisra (850 A. D.). It is believed that he was defeated in a discussion by Śaṅkara and that he became an ascetic under the name Suresvara and followed the preachings of Śaṅkara. Some scholars do not favour this identity between Maṇḍanamisra and Suresvara.

Śaṅkara was born in 632 A. D. at Kāladi in Malabar. He studied *Vedānta* under Govindabhagavatpāda, the pupil of Gauḍapāda. At a very early age, he became an ascetic, travelled far and wide in the land and preached his doctrines. He died at the early age of 32.

He did not approve the authority of the *Āgamas* on the ground that they recognised certain views and principles which were definitely opposed to those of the *Vedas*. He wrote the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras*, the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* on the *Bhagavadgīta* and the commentaries on the major and prominent *Upaniṣads*. Apart from these, he wrote a number of works big and small with the sole purpose of giving an exposition to the tenets of *Advaita*. Important among them are the *Ātmabodha*, *Daśaślokī*, *Aparoksānubhūti*, *Prapañcasāra*, *Upadeśasāhasrī*, *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, *Praśnottara-ratnamālīkā* *Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya* and others.

Suresvara, who is identified by some critics with Maṇḍanamisra, wrote the *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣadvārtika* and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*. He is placed in the period 620-700 A. D. Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* was commented by (1) Padmapāda (625-705 A. D.) pupil of Śaṅkara in his *Pancapādikā* (2) Vācaspatimisra (850 A. D.) in his *Bhāmatī* (3) Anubhūtiśvarupacārya (C. 1000 A. D., in his *Prakāṭārthavivarana* (4) Ānandagiri (C. 1250 A. D.) in his *Nyāyanirṇaya* and (5) Citsukha (c. 1225 A. D.) in his *Bhāṣyabhāva-prakāśika*. Śaṅkara's *Bhagavad-*

gītābhāṣya and *Upanisadbhāṣyas* were commented by Ānandagiri (C. 1250 A. D.). Vācaspatimiśra commented on Maṇḍanamisra's *Brahmasiddhi* in his *Tattvasamīksā* which is now lost. Vimuktātman's *Iṣṭasiddhi* is a polemical treatise on *Advaita* written in a terse style. The author's date is placed between 850 A. D. and 1050 A. D. The *Samkṣepaśārīraka* of Sarvajñātman (C. 900 A. D.), gives a summary of Śankara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. The *Pramāṇalaksana* and *Pañcaprakriyā* are the two other works of the same writer. Prakāśātman's (C. 1200 A. D.) *Pancapādikāvivarṇa* is a commentary on the *Pancapādikā* of Padmapāda and his *Nyāyasaṅgraha* is a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. During the same period, Śrīharṣa, the famous author of the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, wrote the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* a polemical treatise mainly directed against the *Nyāya* system and in defence of *Advaita*. Vācaspatimiśra's *Bhāmati* was commented in the *Kalpataru* by Amalananda (1225 A. D.). Besides writing his commentary on Śankara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, Citsukha (C. 1225 A. D.), wrote commentaries on the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, *Brahmasiddhi* and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* and also an independent treatise *Tattvadīpikā* which was criticised by Vyāsayati (C. 1300 A. D.) in his *Nyāyāmṛta*. Vidyāranya, identical with Mādhava of Vijayanagar (1297-1386 A. D.), wrote the *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, *Pancadaśī*, *Jīvanmuktiviveka* and *Vaiyāsikyanyāyamālā*. The last mentioned work is considered to have been written partly by Vidyāranya and partly by Bharatīrtha. Sadānanda of the 15th century A. D. wrote the *Vedantasāra* a very valuable manual on *Advaita*. The *Advaitaparibhāṣa* also called *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* was written in the 16th century A. D. by Dharmarājādhvarin. It is an excellent manual of logical metaphysics of the *Advaita* school. Vijñānabhikṣu (1550 A. D.), the author of works on the *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* systems, wrote a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* called *Vijñānāmṛta*. The *Advaitasiddhi* of Madhusūdanasarasvatī (C. 1600 A. D.) is in defence of the *Advaita* school and is a criticism of the *Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsayati. The *Siddhāntabindu*, a commentary on the *Daśaślokī* of Śankara, *Gūḍhārthadīpikā* a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Prāsthānabheda* on the various systems of study are the other works of the same writer. Appayadīkṣita (1552-1624), wrote the *Siddhāntaleśasangraha* containing a list of the doctrines of the *Advaita* school, *Nyāyarakṣamaṇi* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, *Parimala* a commentary on the *Kalpataru* of Amalananda, and *Nayamanjarī* on the tenets of the *Advaita*. Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, who was the pupil of Appayadīkṣita, wrote the *Tattvakaustubha* on the principles of the *Advaita* school. Annambhaṭṭa (c. 1700) commented on the *Brahmasūtras* in the *Mitākṣarā*.

VISIṢṬADVAITA

This school recognises three realities Supreme Being, individual

souls and matter. The *bheda*, *abheda* and *ghaṭaka* passages of the *Upanisads* are all taken as valid proving that the Brahman is the only one reality which exists having for its modes the animate beings and the inanimate objects. The modes are mutually different. The modes qualify the Brahman from which they are different. Hence in this system there is monism due to its being qualified by the modes¹. Hence this school has come to acquire the name *Viśiṣṭādvaita*. The world is real. Souls and matter are many. The souls are atomic in size. The souls and matter are the body of the Supreme Being. They exist only for God. Hence they are *Śeṣa* and the Supreme Being is called *Śeṣin* who has control over the *śeṣa* as a soul over the body². The souls are of three types viz., those in bondage (*baddha*), released (*mukta*) and eternally free (*nitya*). Viṣṇu with His consort Lakṣmī, Ādiśeṣa, Garuḍa and others come under the last class. Other souls come under the two others. Among the courses mentioned in the *Bhagavadgītā*, this school recognises the path of devotion and the path of resignation unto God (*prapatti*). By doing one's duties, one gets the soul purified thus qualifying for the path of knowledge (*jñānayoga*). This knowledge in this school consists of the realisation that the individual soul is distinct from matter and is an attribute of God. This realisation leads the soul to the path of devotion which could be put to practise with the help of *yama*, *niyama* and other courses of meditation. Success in this sphere is possible only by the surrender (*prapatti*) of the self to God. Those, who are not qualified for this path, could simply surrender themselves to God. Self-surrender (*Ātmanikṣepa*) is therefore the easiest and surest way to get to the goal (*Mokṣa*) in which state differences among the souls are wiped out, and there is 'unitive consciousness and abolition of pluralistic consciousness' 'There is the loss of self-feeling' in that state 'but not self-existence. The released state is one of bliss in the company of other released souls. The souls derive pleasure by serving the Supreme Being. Viṣṇu with Lakṣmī is considered as the Brahman. One cannot exist without the other. They are the *jagatamāpatī* and *divyadampatī*. A section of the followers of this school holds Lakṣmī to be an ordinary soul and the consort of the Supreme Being. God has a body not made up of matter (*aprākṛta*).

Perception, inference and verbal testimony are the means of proof recognised by this school. In addition to the *Upanisads*, *Brahma-*

1. अशेषचिदचित्प्रकारं ब्रह्मैकमेव तत्त्वम् । तत्र प्रकारप्रकारिणोः प्रकाराणाञ्च मिथोऽत्यन्तभेदेऽपि विशिष्टैक्यादिविवक्षयैकत्वव्यपदेशः, तदितरनिषेधश्च । *Vedāntadeśika's Nyāyasiddhāntajana* Ch. I.

2. परगतातिशयाधानेच्छया उपादेयत्वमेव यस्य स्वरूपं स शेषः परः शेषी । *Vedārthasaṅgraha* of Rāmānuja pp. 234-235 Brindaban Edition.

sūtras and *Bhagavadgītā*, this school treats the *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* as authoritative texts. The *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* are of two types viz., *Pāñcarātra* and *Vaikhānasa*. They speak of the Supreme Being as existing in five ways in different places viz., *Para* in *Vaikhunṭha*, *Vyūha* in the milky ccean, *Vibhava* in the incarnated forms, *Antaryāmin* in the form of the soul within the individual souls and matter and *arcā* being present in idols which are worshipped. The *Pāñcarātra Āgamas* lay down the way of life for one who follows this school of thought, give rules for the worship of the images and symbols in houses and temples and derive their title on account of the five-fold duties of routine life in a day. The five duties are *Abhigamana* going to the temple of God concentrating mind, speech and actions on Him, *Upādāna* collecting materials for this worship, *Ijyā* actual worship, *Svādhyāya* Vedic study or chanting of the sacred hymns and *Yoga* meditation. Dictates of morality and religion are to be respected while practising the routine work. The *Pāñcarātrā Āgamas* are of high authority as the *Vedas*. The leading exponents of this school have proved that the preachings of the *Āgamas* (*Vaiṣṇava*) are not opposed to those of the *Vedas*. Aniruddha, one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu, preached these doctrines and they were revealed to Nārada, Sanaka, Sāṇḍilya and others. Hence these are called *Bhagavacchāstra*. The validity of the doctrines of the *Āgamas* (*Pāñcarātra*) is proved in the *Nārāyaṇīya* section of the *Mahābhārata*. The sources of these doctrines could be traced to the *Bhagavadgītā*, *Bhāgavata*, *Nāradasūtras* and *Sāṇḍilyasūtras*. Like the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas*, the *Vaikhānasa Āgamas* also are held to be equally authoritative. This *Āgama* assumed this name because it was revealed by Vikhanas or Brahmā to Atri, Marīci, Kāśyapa and Bhṛgu each of whom brought forth his own accounts of the doctrines. Each work is called *Samhitā* e. g., *Atrisamhitā*. It is held that there were 108 *Samhitas* of the *Pāñcaratra Āgama*. Only some among them are now available. Among these, *Pauskara*, *Sāttvata* and *Jayākyasamhitas* are important and related to these are the *Īśvara*, *Pādma*, *Pārameśvara* and other *Samhitas*.

In addition to these texts, this school treats the *Divyaprabandha* containing 4000 stanzas in Tamil as authoritative texts representing the views of this school. They are the compositions of the holy saints called Ālvārs. These are held to be as valid as the *Vedas*.

The earliest authorities of this school were Taṅka (also known as Brahmanandin), Dramiḍa, Guhadeva and others. Upavarṣa, who was also called Bodhāyana and who wrote a *vṛtti* on the *Brahmasūtras*, is also treated as an authority of this school. Nothing definite is known about these writers. Next come the Alvars, After them came Nāthamuni whose full name is Raṅganāthamuni

(824-924 A. D.). He wrote the *Nyāyatattva* and *Yogarahasya* on the philosophy of this school. They are now lost and are known only from the quotations of later writers. His grandson Yāmuna, who was born in 916 A. D., wrote besides the *Stotraratna* and *Catuṣṣloki*, the *Āgamaprāmānya* vindicating the validity of the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas*, the *Siddhitraya* comprising *Ātmasiddhi*, *Īśvarasiddhi* and *Samvitsiddhi*, the *Gītārthasaṅgraha*, and *Mahāpuruṣanirṇaya*.

Rāmānuja was born in 1037 A. D., at Śrīperumbudur near Kāñcī. He studied *Advaita Vedānta* under Yādavaprakāśa at Kāñcī. Afterwards, he became a pupil of Śrīpūrṇa one of the disciples of the Yāmuna, assumed the order of ascetics and travelled all through the land preaching the doctrines of *Viśiṣṭādvaita*. He wrote 1. The *Śrībhāṣya* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* 2. *Vedāntasāra* 3. *Vedāntadīpa*, 4. *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*, 5. *Vedārthasaṅgraha* in which he discussed briefly the purport of the *Vedas*, 6. *Gadyatraya* and 7. *Nitya* a manual on the mode of worshipping God. The *Vedāntasāra* and *Vedāntadīpa* are brief commentaries on the *Brahmasūtras*. The *Śrībhāṣya* was commented by (1) Meghanādāri in his *Nayaprakāśikā* and *Bhāṣyabhāṣyabodhana*, (2) Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka in his *Nyāyasudarśana*, (3) Sudarśanasūri in his *Śrutaprakāśikā* and *Śrutapradīpikā*, (4) Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A. D.) in his *Tattvaṭīkā* and (5) Raṅgarāmānujamuni (c. 1600 A. D.) in his *Mūlabhāṣyaprakāśikā*. Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka and Meghanādāri are known to have lived about 1200 A. D. Sudarśanasūri lived in the latter half of the 13th century A.D.

Parāśarabhaṭṭa (c. 1100 A. D.), son of Śrīvatsāṅka, wrote the *Tattvaratnākara* a polemical treatise which is now lost. The *Bhagavadgūṇadarpaṇa* is his commentary on the *Viṣṇusahāraṇsma*. Meghanādāri's *Nayadyumaṇi* is an independent treatise on the doctrines of this school as also the *Prajñāparitrāṇa* of Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka. Varadācārya (c. 1270 A. D.) wrote four small but important works *Prapannapārijāta*, *Prameyamālā*, *Tattvanirṇaya* and *Tattvasāra*. Sudarśanasūri, author of the *Śrutaprakāśikā*, wrote the *Tātparyadīpikā* a commentary on the *Vedārthasaṅgraha* of Rāmānuja and the *Śukapaksīya* a commentary on the *Bhāgavata*. Ātreya Rāmānuja, who lived in the latter half of the 13th century and who was the preceptor of Vedāntadeśika, wrote the *Nyāyakulīśa* in defence of *Viśiṣṭādvaita*.

Vedāntadeśika wrote about 118 works of which nearly 15 are now lost. Among these more than forty are written in Tamil; about thirty-five are poems, lyrics, on rituals and other topics. Outstanding among these independent treatises are 1. The *Tattvamuktākalāpa* with his own commentary *Sarvārthasiddhi*, 2. *Śatadūṣaṇi* a criticism of *Advaita* 3. *Saccaritrarakṣā* 4. *Nikseparakṣā* 5. *Pāñcarātrarakṣā* 6. *Nyāyapariśuddhi* 7. *Nyāyasiddhānjanā* 8. *Mīmamsāpādukā* 9. *Adhikaraṇasārāvali*. His chief commentaries are 1. *Śeṣvara-*

mīmāṃsā on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* in defence of theism, 2. *Tātparyacandrikā* on Rāmānuja's *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*, 3. *Tattvaṭīkā* on the *Śrībhāṣya* 4. *Īśāvāsyopaniṣadbhāṣya* 5. *Gītārthasaṅgraharaksā* on the *Gītārthasaṅgraha* of Yāmuna and 6. *Rahasyaraksā* on Rāmānuja's, *Gadyatraya*. His originality in the treatment of the topics of the sciences and masterly powers of argumentation are revealed in these works. In this school, he is considered next only to Rāmānuja as the authoritative exponent. His *Mīmāṃsapādukā* was commented by his son Varadācārya.

Appayadīkṣita (c. 1600 A. D.), wrote the *Nayamayūkhamālikā* a commentary on the *Brhmasūtras* in the light of this school. Māhācārya (c. 1600 A. D.), was a contemporary of Appayadīkṣita. He wrote the *Caṇḍamaruta* on the *Satadūsaṇi* of Vedāntadeśika. He is also the author of six polemical treatises *Adraitavidyāvijaya*, *Gurūpasattivijaya*, *Parikaravijaya*, *Pārāśaryavijaya*, *Brahmavidyāvijaya* and *Sadvidyāvijaya*. About the same period lived Raṅgarāmānujamuni, who acquired the title *Upaniṣadbhāṣyakāra* by writing commentaries on the important *Upaniṣads*. He wrote a commentary on the *Nyāyapariśuddhi* of Vedāntadeśika and the *Bhāvaprakāśikā* a commentary on the *Srutaprakāśikā* of Sudarśanasūri. His *Viśayavākyadīpikā* is an independent treatise being an exposition of some important passages of the *Upaniṣads*. An account of the school of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* is given in the *Yatīndramatadīpikā* by Srīnivāsācārya the pupil of Mahācārya.

SUDDHĀDVAITA

In this system, the Brahman is both *saṅguṇa* and *nirguṇa*. It is the cause for the origin, maintenance and destruction of the world. It has *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* as its attributes which are real. It is one and infinite, the *antaryāmin* of the individual souls and the inherent and instrumental cause of the world. It is full (*pūrṇa*) and is called *Puruṣottama* having a body which is full of bliss. In these respects, it is having attributes *saṅguṇa*). It does not have the attributes of ordinary persons and is therefore *nirguṇa*. The individual souls are real, forming part of the Brahman and are like the sparks of fire in the form of the Brahman. They are atomic in size. Since they form part of the Brahman, they are not different from it. They are also Brahman with latent bliss (*ānanda*). Thus they are identical with the Brahman. The difference which is found to exist between the individual souls and the Brahman is not therefore natural but is due to the will of the Supreme Being. It is not due also to nescience (*māyā*) as in *Advaita* and therefore this school is called *Suddhādvaita*. By His free will God would give the individual souls a divine body as His own to sport with Him eternally. The relation between God and soul is one of the lord

and the lady (*vāyakanāyikābhāṣṭ*). Devotion and self-surrender are the means to get His grace. The God worshipped in this system is Kṛṣṇa under the name Gopījanavallabha and Srī Govardhananāthajī or Srī Nāthajī. The preceptor (*guru*) on earth is regarded as divine and gets divine honours. This school takes as authorities, the *Vedas*, *Bhagavadgītā* and *Upaniṣads* and also the *Bhāgavata*. A soul gets salvation by knowing the seven fold meaning of the *Bhagavata* viz, *Sākhā*, *Skandha*, *Prakaraṇa*, *Adhyāya*, *Vākya*, *Pada* and *Akṣara*.

Vallabhācārya (1473-1531 A. D.) was the founder of this school. His *Aṇubhāṣya* is a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. He left it incomplete. His son Viṭṭhalanāthajī completed it. Vallabha wrote a commentary called *Subodhini* on the *Bhāgavata*. He wrote sixteen smaller treatises summarising the doctrines and teachings of the school. The *Aṇubhāṣya* was commented in the *Bhāṣya-prakāśa* by Puruṣottama pupil of Vallabha which was in its turn commented in the *Rāṣmi* by Gopeśvara. The *Vedāntādhikaraṇamālā* is an independent work on the philosophy of this school by Puruṣottama. Srījayagopāla wrote a commentary on the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*. The *Brahmasūtras* were commented in the *Bhāṣya-prakāśikā* by Kṛṣṇacandra.

NIMBĀRKA

This school was founded by Nimbārka in the 12th century A. D. The Brahman in this school is both *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa*. The world is only the manifestation of the Brahman. The universe is identical with and at the same time separate from the Brahman. The universe includes souls and matter. Thus this school admits monism and dualism (*dvaitādvaita*). The souls, which are under the control of the Brahman, continue to be identical with and separate from the Brahman in the released state also. The *Mokṣa* consists in assimilating the true nature of the Brahman. It is got through knowledge and self-surrender. The Supreme Being is worshipped in the form of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. The system is also called *Sanakasampradāya*.

Nimbārka wrote the *Vedāntapārijāṭasaurabha* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* which was commented by Srīnivāsa an immediate follower of Nimbārka. Nimbārka also wrote the *Daśaśloki* on the principles of his system. Kesavācārya also called Keśavakāśmīrin (c. 1600 A. D.) wrote the *Kaustubhaprabhā* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, *Tattvaparakāśikā* a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* and commentaries on the important *Upaniṣads*, *Viṣṇusahasra-nāma* and other texts.

BHĀSKARA

Bhāskara (c. 900 A. D.) held that the Brahman has auspicious qualities and at the same time is bound and also released on account of

attribute (*Upādhi*), that is, changed into the world full of impurities. There is unity and multiplicity in the Brahman and both are real. There is unity when the Brahman is in the causal state and multiplicity in the evolved state. The individual souls are identical with the Brahman but are different due to some limitation. The Brahman undergoes the experience of the infinite souls. Bhāskara admits the adoption of *jñāna* and *karma* courses combined together. Bhāskara wrote the *Bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras*. This school is also called *Tridandīmata*.

YĀDAVAPRAKĀŚA

Yādavaprakāśa was an Advaitin in the 11th century A. D. He lived at Kāñcī and taught *Vedānta* to Rāmānuja. In a dispute which took place between him and *Ramaṇuja* in his latter days, it is said that he was defeated by Rāmānuja and became a pupil of Rāmānuja following the *Viśiṣṭadvaita* school. According to him, the Brahman changes into animate and inanimate objects. Consequently the Brahman becomes the place or support of various impurities but is in the pure state. It is not known whether Yādavaprakāśa commented on the *Brahmasūtras*. His commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* is lost. The lexicon *Vaijñāyāṇī* and the *Yatidharmasamuccaya* on the duty of ascetics are attributed to him.

CAITANYA

The name of Caitanya is associated with the spread of Bengal Vaisnavism. His original name was Viśvambhara. He was born in 1485 A. D. His personal handsomeness earned him the name Gaura or Gaurāṅga. In 1509, he became an ascetic under the title Srī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya. He died in 1533 A. D. His cult places *Bhakti* over *jñāna* and *yoga*. Devotion is treated as a sentiment which is felt while adoring Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Caitanya was greatly influenced by Śrīdhara's commentary on the *Bhāgavata*. Jayadeva's *Gita-govinda* and the *Bhakti* cult of the *Viśiṣṭadvaita* school appear to have moulded the doctrines of this cult.

Caitanya did not leave any literary piece behind him to support his preachings. The authorship of the *Śikṣāstaka* which contains an account of the dictates of this cult is attributed to him. Sanātana-gosvamin was one of the pupils of Caitanya. He wrote the *Vaiṣṇavatoṣaṇī* a commentary on the *Bhāgavata* and also the *Brhat-bhāgavatāmṛta*. Rūpagosvāmin, the younger brother of Sanātana-gosvāmin and a pupil of Caitanya wrote (1) the *Laghubhāgavatāmṛta* on the model of his brother's work and (2) the *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* on devotion as a sentiment. Besides, he wrote a number of other works which come under *alaṅkāra*, anthology, lyrics, dramas, and other branches of study. The mystical and metaphysical dogmas

were dealt with in the *Bhāgavatasandarbhā* by Jīvagosvāmin. On the rituals and religions practises, one Gopālabhaṭṭa wrote the *Haribhaktivilāsa*. On the lives of Sanātana, Rūpa and Jīva gosvāmins, Kṛṣṇadāsakavirāja wrote *Caitanyacaritāmṛta*, *Premavilāsa* and *Govindalīlāmṛta*. In the light of the teachings of this school, Baladeva Vidayābhūṣaṇa of the 18th century A. D., wrote the *Govindabhāṣya* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*.

ŚIVĀDVAITA

The *Śivādvaita* school holds Śiva as the highest God and except for this it is similar to the *Viśiṣṭadvaita* school. Śrīkaṇṭha is considered as the earliest authority on the school. The development of, this school is closely connected with *Saivism*. It appears Śrīkaṇṭha made an attempt to connect the religion of *Saivism* with *Upaniṣad* principles. The identity of Śrīkaṇṭha and his date have not been settled. He wrote a *Bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras* which is called after his name. To him, the *Saiva Āgamas* are of the same authority as the *Vedas*. He mentions *pati* the lord, *paśu* the soul and *pāśa* bonds as the three principles in this school. Appayadikṣita (C. 1600 A. D.) contributed much for this school. He commented on the *Bhāṣya* of Śrīkaṇṭha in his *Sivārkaṁāṇidīpikā*. In his *Bhārata-tātparyasaṅgraha* which gives a summary of the epic *Mahābhārata*, he gives an interpretation of the epic in support of *Saivism*. Similarly he interprets the *Rāmāyaṇa* in his *Rāmāyaṇa-tātparyasaṅgraha*. His other works on this school are the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*, *Sikharīṇīmālā*, *Sivādvaitanirṇaya*, *Tattvasiddhāntavyākhyā* and *Nayamaṇīmālā*.

THE RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS OF ŚAIVISM

PĀSUPATA, ŚAIVA, KASHMIRIAN ŚAIVISM AND ŚAKTAISM

There are certain religious schools which are wholly based on the *Āgamas*. The *Pāsupata*, *Saiva* and Kashmirian Saivite schools are based on the *Saiva Āgamas*. The *Sakta Āgamas* are said to be 28 in number and the *Sak'a* 77. The two *Āgamas* are closely related to each other. The *Saiva Āgamas* believe in the worship of Siva as the highest deity and the *Sakta Āgamas* in that of *Sakti* regarded as the world-mother. The two *Āgamas* have in their respective literatures traces of mutual influence. Each of these four schools have mostly something in common with each other.

PĀSUPATA

This school is also called the *Nokulīpāsupata* school. Siva is the lord and every one other than the lord is *paśu*. The doctrines of this school were preached by Lakulīṣa about the beginning of the Christian era. The *Paśupatisūtras* and the works of Haradattācārya

who is quoted in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (c. 1400 A. D.) are considered as the authoritative texts of this school.

ŚAIVA

This school is based on the *Śaiva Āgamas* among which the *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇā*, *Suprabheda* and *Vātula* are highly authoritative. Śiva is the highest deity. The souls, which are in bondage, could get release (*Mokṣa*) through the understanding of the six principles viz, *pati* lord, *vidyā* knowledge of reality, *avidyā* erroneous knowledge, *paśu* individual souls, *pāśa* impurities like *karma*, *māyā* and others and *kṛpā* the worship of Śiva which is the means to get rid of bondage. The path of devotion is to be adopted by the souls. The principles of *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are followed in this school. The *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Śrīkaṇṭha, though it may come under *Vedānta*, may be considered to lend support to the views of this school. The *Tattraprakāśa* of King Bhoja (1005-1054 A. D.) of Dhārā is held as the authoritative text on this school as also the works *Rāmakaṇṭha* (1150 A. D.), and *Aghoraśiva* of the same period.

This school is called the *Śaiva Siddhānta* in the Tamil land where it is based on the extensive Tamil literature written by Saivite teachers.

The *Kāpālikas*, *Kālānukhas*, *Līṅgāyats* and other schools are the off-shoots of or allied to the *Pāśupata* and *Śaiva* schools.

KASHMIRIAN SAIVISM

In Kashmir, *Saivism* had two-fold developments. One was the *Spanda* branch and the other was the *Pratyabhijñā* branch. Both are based on the *Śaiva Āgamas*. The *Spanda* branch holds that Śiva creates the world. He is not the material cause nor does He need any. He is not affected by the creation which is real. The means to get salvation are *Śāmbhava*, *Ānava* and *others*.¹ While holding the same view on these points, the *Pratyabhijñā* school holds the souls, which are separate from each other as not different from Śiva the highest God. This could be realised by the recognition that 'I am God, I am not distinct from Him.' Through this recognition is the final release secured and hence the name of the school. This recognition is not produced for the individual souls which are obscured by *Māyā*. In this respect, it leans towards the *Advaita* school of *Vedānta*.

The doctrines of the *Spanda* branch were revealed to Vasugupta (850 A. D.) who taught them in the form of the *Śivasūtras* to Kallāṭa. Vasugupta's work on this branch of *Saivism* is the

1. K. C. Pandey : *Abhinavagupta An Historical and Philosophical Study*. P. 97.

Spandakārikā which was commented in the *Spandasarvasva* by Kallaṭa. The *Spandaprīṭipikā* of Utpaladeva (c. 1000 A. D.) and the *Spandanirṇaya* of Kṣemarāja (c. 1000 A. D.) are the important works on this branch.

The doctrines of the *Pratyabhijnā* branch were expounded for the first time by Somānanda (circa 850 A. D.), in his *Sivadr̥ṣṭi*. Utpaladeva, who lived in the first half of the 10th century A. D. and different from the writer of the same name of the *Spanda* branch, wrote the *Īśvarapratyabhijnākārikā* with his own *vṛtti*, *Īśvarasiddhi* with his own *vṛtti* and other works. Abhinavagupta, the author of the *Dhvanyālokalocana*, was the greatest authority of the *Pratyabhijnā* branch. The *Tāntrika* literature was enriched by his *Bodhapancadaśikā*, *Mālinīvijayavārtikā*, *Parāśrīṃśikāvivarana*, *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra* and others. His *Bhagavadgītārthasangraha* is a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* from the *Saiva* point of view. His *Paramārthasāra* deals with the essential principles of the *Sāṅkhya* philosophy in the light of *Saivism*. He commented on the *Īśvarapratyabhijnākārikā* of Utpaladeva in his *Īśvarapratyabhijnāvimarsinī* and on Utpala's *Īśvarapratyabhijnākārikāvṛtti* in his *Īśvarapratyabhijnāvivṛtivismarsinī*. His *Anuttarāṣṭikā*, *Paramārthadvādaśikā*, *Paramārthacarcā* and *Mahopadeśavimśatikā* deal with *Saivism*. His *Sivadr̥ṣṭyāloca* the commentary on Somānanda's *Sivadr̥ṣṭi*, *Prakīrṇakavivarana* on the philosophical and grammatical aspects of religion, and other works are now lost and are known only from references.

SĀKTAISM

Sāktism recognises the worship of *Sakti*. In this school, stress is laid on the power of sounds, the presence in the human body of a number of threads of occult force (*vāḍi*) and six great centres of occult force (*cakra*) each resembling a lotus. Faith is laid in the mystic forms of *yoga*, magic power of diagrams (*yantra*) and gestures made with the fingers (*mudrās*). The *Sokti-sūtras* and the *Sākta Āgamas* are held as the most authoritative texts of this school. The *Āgamas* of this school are five *Subhāgamas*, sixty four *Kaulāgamas* and eight *Mīśra Āgamas*. One *Paraśurāma* is said to have written the *Kalpasūtra* called *Paraśurāmakaḥkalpasūtra* which deals with the worship of *Srīvidyā* (the goddess as the embodiment of the highest wisdom). The *Lalitātrīṣaṭbhāṣya* and the *Sundaryalahari* of Saṅkara are in favour of the worship of *Sakti*. Bhaskarācārya (c. 1000 A. D.) wrote the *Siva-sūtravārtika* a commentary on the *Siva sūtras* and *Varivasyāprakāśa*. The *Tantrarāja*, *Brahmānanda's Sāktānandatarāṅgiṇī*, Kṛṣṇānanda's *Tantrasāra* and Puṇyānanda's *Kāmakalā* are some among many other important works on this school. This school is more closely connected with the Vedic texts than

the other *Saiva* schools. Some of the Saivite schools like the *Pāśupatas* and *Kāpālikas* were greatly influenced by *Sākta* practices and found themselves expressed in gruesome practices like offering animals and human beings to the deities. *Sāktism* influenced the Buddhists to a great extent making them take to *Tāntric* practices.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Never was an attempt made in ancient India to write a history of philosophy. Attempts were however made to bring together all the systems of thought on the basis of some similarities between them. To Saṅkara's authorship is attributed the *Sarvavedānta-siddhāntasaṅgraha*. Sāntarakṣita a Buddhist of the 8th century A. D. wrote the *Tattvasaṅgraha* which was commented by his pupil Kamalaśīla. The *Ṣaḍḍarśanasamuccaya* was written by Haribhadrasūri (1200 A. D.). Mādhava, son of Sāyaṇa of Vijayanagar, wrote about 1400 A. D., the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. There is also an anonymous *Sarvamatasāṅgraha*. Nārāyanabhaṭṭa's (c. 1600 A. D.) *Mānameyodaya* deals with the means of proof (*māna*) and the knowables (*meya*) in the various systems of thought. Mahāmahopādhyāya Lakṣmīpurāṇa Srīnivāsācārya wrote in 1925 the *Mānameyodayarahasyaślokaṭīkā*.

CHAPTER XXXVI

CONCLUSION

A perusal of the contents of the previous chapters would show that there had not been any branch of learning or topic which did not have its literature recorded in *Sanskṛta*. In other words, the popularity of *Sanskṛta* as the literary language is revealed here. The Buddhists and the Jains, who attempted with little success to dethrone it from its position in the pre-Christian era, preferred at a later stage to use it for literary purposes.

As its name *Sanskṛta* suggests, it became so perfected at the hands of the grammarians that no other language could bear comparison to it in any aspect whether pronunciation, diction, vocabulary, or syntax. It is but natural that it came to be called as *दैवी वाक्* which shows that it attained divinity. The languages of India, without exception, have been enriched through their association with *Sanskṛta*.

The importance of *Sanskṛta* as the language of Indian literature is all the more great, because it is in the literature written in this language that Indian's cultural values were recorded. India's eminence has been mainly due to her cultural heritage. During the hours of need and trials, the countries, which lay beyond the frontiers of India, took inspiration and guidance from India.

From a study of the literature written in this language, we get a vivid account of the various aspects of India's culture and the many-sided achievements of India in the past. More than material prosperity, spiritual progress received attention and gained significance in the daily life of the people. The importance of the soul and the care to keep it ever pure were always uppermost in the minds of the Indian thinkers. Material welfare was therefore shaped to suit the need of the soul. Hence was stress laid on the need to practice *ahimsa* and tolerance. The age-long trials, underwent by the Indians, made them have faith in the doctrines of *karma* and transmigration which were studied and grasped in all their aspects. A thorough-going spirit of optimism and the courage to face the unexpected and inevitable events in life have given the Indian nation a peculiar stamp and this has been mainly due to the influence of the Hindu religion and the observances which its followers put to practice. Religion and philosophy work hand-in-hand. The Indians have been practising what they felt as fit to be done on the strength of the eternal truths as taught in Indian philosophy.

The world of knowledge owes much to India for her contributions. The branches of *Sikṣā*, grammar and music show that the Indians had, at a period when the rest of the world was in the dark, a thorough grasp over sound, its places of production and its varieties. "The Sanskrit grammarians of India were the first to analyse word-forms, to recognize the difference between root and suffix, to determine the functions of suffixes, and on the whole to elaborate a grammatical system so accurate and complete as to be unparalleled in any other country." ¹ Remarkable progress was made in the fields of Medicine, and Astronomy. The results achieved in the sphere of philosophy crown other achievements. Both the good and evil effects of anarchy, monarchy and democracy were studied by experience and the democratic state of government with the hereditary king at its head was chosen as the best form of administration. The evil effects of material progress were not unknown to India. The *Matsyapurana* tells how the demons attacked the innocent women and children indiscriminately from the air. It is not known how they manufactured weapons and instruments. In the sciences in particular, the instruments should have been in use. It is probable that some scientists, who were responsible for the manufacture of the weapons and instruments, found them misused and with the good intention to save posterity from utter ruin destroyed what all they had with them.

With the advent of the invaders like the Greeks, Muslims and foreign nations of Europe in recent period, India began to decline gradually in her cultural eminence. All the foreigners have attempted with little success to destroy the cultural values of India. They have attempted to underrate the eminence of India in the past. In recent years, the critics of the West have suggested a Greek origin for anything that is good in India and have endeavoured, without any basis, to prove that the Buddhists had been the forerunners in every branch of learning, nay anything attractive in India. The Buddhists, it must be remembered, have been only Hindus for a long time in the past and have established a new religion in opposition to the Hindu religion attaching great emphasis for some of the principles which have formed part of the Hindu religion. It had success in the initial stages because Gautama and his followers captivated the masses who were not in a position to controvert or argue their preaching. It had a thorough failure when the savants like Kumarila, Sankara and Udayana attacked their doctrines. The critics of the West, have been telling that as a result of the religious persecutions launched against them by these savants and their followers, the Buddhists saved themselves by migrating into Tibet and China. The facts are different. In order to escape from suffering open defeat at the hands of the Hindus in discussions and

1. Macdonell ; India's Past P, 136.

to save their religion from utter ruin, the Buddhists fled to Tibet and China. Again, it is these critics who have started the theory of the Aryan immigration into India which has been accepted, without protest and discussion, as genuine by many Indians.

Taking advantage of the absence of written evidences of historical value, the critics of the West have been attributing unreality to historical events and treating the dates, which are traditionally accepted by the Indians, as merely hypothetical. Their findings are far from truth. Indians chose to retain certain things in the form of works and certain others in the memory of the people. The events recorded in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* must have been real. The traditional date 3100 B. C. for the Mahābhārata cannot be questioned. More powerful and reliable than the written records is racial memory. The entire nation could not have erred. From the standards set up by the Western critics, these facts may not be measured but on that ground they could not be treated as unreal. India has its own mode of preserving certain matters to posterity.

Now, India's history is to be rewritten in the light of the records available in India. Then alone, India's glorious heritage could be properly understood and appreciated. Without knowing the past, one cannot shape the future. "The whole past history of the world would be darkness to him, and not knowing what those who came before him had done for him, he would probably care little to do anything for those who are to come after him."¹ It is idle, as some do, to laugh at the glorious past merely blinded by the glamour of the present. 'No nation on the surface of the earth has ever become great by despising its own glories and by eking out its miserable existence with a few crumps falling from the mouths of others.'² India has to assert and maintain her individuality. Without a study of the *Sanskṛta* literature, India's cultural eminence cannot be maintained. In this connection it will not be out of place if the words of Prof. Max Muller on the advantages of *Sanskṛta* and the greatness of the Indian nation are quoted. He writes in *What Can India Teach Us* :—'Take any of the burning questions of the day—popular education, higher education, parliamentary representation, codification of laws, finance emigration, poor-law, and whether you have anything to teach and to try, or anything to observe and to learn, India will supply you with a laboratory such as exists nowhere else. That very Sanskrit, the study of which may at first seem so tedious to you and so useless, if only you will carry it on 'will open before you large layers of literature, as yet almost unknown

1. Max Muller : *What can India Teach Us* P. 17.

2. Pandit Baladeva Upadhyaya :

Introduction to Vedābhāṣyabhūmikāsaṅgraha, Pp. iii and iv.

and unexplored, and allow you an insight into strata of thought deeper than any you have known before, and rich in lessons that appeal to the deepest sympathies of the human heart'¹ 'Whatever sphere of the human mind you may select for your special study, whether it be language, or religion, or mythology, or philosophy, whether it be laws or customs, primitive art or primitive science, everywhere, you have to go India, whether you like it or not, because some of the most valuable and most instructive materials in the history of man are treasured up in India and in India only.'² India ought to feel very grateful for the valuable researches conducted, although in a different spirit, by the critics of the West without which India's greatness would ever have been hidden in the dark and she does.

-
1. Max. Muller : What Can India Teach Us Pp. 13 and 14
 2. " " P. 15.
-

APPENDIX

Works based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Vālmīki is considered as the Ādikavi by all later writers without exception. His epic was the source of inspiration for all poets.

अहो, सकलकविसार्थसाधारणी खल्वियं वाल्मीकीया सुभाषितनीवी ।

Murāri : *Anargharāghava* Prologue

It is Vālmīki that showed the use of graceful expressions.

मधुमयफणित्रीनां मार्गदर्शी महर्षिः ।

Bhoja : *Rāmāyaṇacampu* I. 8.

Vālmīki advocates the choice of a theme connected with Rāma,

न ह्यन्योऽर्हति काव्यानां यशोभाग्राघवादृते ।

Rāmāyaṇa Uttarakāṇḍa 98-18

The epic of Vālmīki made many late writers choose themes from it for their works

The following are the works which are based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*

Name of the work.	Author	Type of the work	Date
1. Pratimānāṭaka	Attributed to Bhāsa	Drama	C. 400 B. C.
2. Abhiṣekanāṭaka	" "	"	" "
3. Yajñaphala	" "	"	" "
4. Raghuvamśa	Kālidāsa	Poem	1st century B.C.
5. Kundamālā	Diñnāga	Drama	C. 200 A. D.
6. Setubandha	Pravarasena	Poem	C. 4th century A. D.
7. Jānakīharana	Kumārādāsa	"	C. 520 A. D.
8. Rāvaṇavadha	Bhaṭṭi	"	C. 644 A. D.
9. Ācaryacūḍāmaṇi	Śaktibhadra	"	C. 700 A. D.
10. Mahāvīracarita	Bhavabhūti	"	"

Name of the work	Author	Type of the work	Date
11. Uttararāmacarita	Bhavabhūti	Drama	C 700 A D
12. Anargharāghava	Murāri	,,	C 800 A. D.
13. Rāmacarita	Abhinanda	Poem	9th Century A.D.
14. Bālarāmāyaṇa	Rājasekhara	Drama	C 900 A D.
15. Mahānāṭaka	Hanumān	,,	C. 1000 A D.
16. Rāmāyaṇacampu	Bhoja	Campu	1005-1054 A D.
17. Rāmāyaṇamañjarī	Kṣemendra	Poem	C 1050 A. D.
18. Rāmapālacarita	Sandhyākara- nandin	,,	,,
19. Prasannarāghava	Jayadeva	Drama	C. 1250 A. D.
20. Unmattarāghava	Bhāskara	,,	C. 1350 A. D.
21. ,, ,, ,,	Virūpākṣa	,,	,,
22. Raghunāthacarita	Vāmanabhaṭṭa- bāṇa	Poem	C. 1420 A. D.
23. Ānandarāghava	Rājacudāmaṇi- dīkṣita	Drama	C. 1620 A. D.
24. Uttaracampū	Veṅkaṭādhvarin	Campu	C. 1650 A. D.
25. Adbhutadarpaṇa	Mahādeva	Drama	,,
26. Jānakīpariṇaya	Cakrakavi	Poem	,,
27. ,,	Rāmabhadra- dīkṣita	Drama	C. 1700 A. D.

Works based on the Mahābhārata

Like the *Rāmāyana*, the *Mahābhārata* has been popular with the poets of the classical period. The main story of the epic together with the episodes contained in it was made use of by them who selected for their compositions the themes from the epic. The epic itself predicts this.

सर्वेषां कविमुख्यानामुपजीव्यो भविष्यति ।
पर्जन्य इव भूतानामक्षयो भारतद्रुमः ॥

Mahābhārata, Ādi I. 108

इतिहासोत्तमादस्माज्जायन्ते कविबुद्धयः ।
पञ्चभ्य इव भूतेभ्यो लोकसंविभ्यस्त्रयः ॥

Mahābhārata, Ādi. II 386

अनाश्रित्यैतदाख्यानं कथा भुवि न विद्यते ।
आहारमनपाश्रित्य शरीरस्येव धारणम् ॥
इदं कविवरैः सर्वैराख्यानमुपजीव्यते ।
उदयप्रेप्सुभिर्भृत्यैरभिजात इवेश्वरः ॥

Mahābhārata, Ādi. II 389-90

The following are the works based on this epic --

Name of the work	Author	Type of the work	Date
1. Pañcarātra	Attributed to Bhāsa	Drama	C. 400 B.C.
2. Dutavākya	"	"	"
3. Madhyamvyāyoga	"	"	"
4. Dūtaghaṭotkaca	"	"	"
5. Karṇabhāra	"	"	"
6. Urubhaṅga	"	"	"
7. Abhijñāna Sakuntala	Kālidāsa	"	1st century .C.
8. Kirātārjuniya	Bhāravi	Poem	C. 600 A. D
9. Veṇisambhāra	Bhaṭṭa-nārayana	Drama	C. 650 A. D
10. Śiśupālavadha	Māgha	Poem	C. 700 A. D.
11. Subhadrādhanañjaya	Kulaśekhara-varman	Drama	C 800 A. D.
12. Kicakavadha	Nīti-varman	Poem	9th century A.D.
13. Bālabhārata	Rājaśekhara	Drama	C 900 A. D.

Name of the work	Author	Type of the work	Date
14. Naiṣadhānanda	Kṣemīśvara	Drama	C. 900 A. D.
15. Nalacampu	Trivikrama- bhaṭṭa	Campu	915 A. D.
16. Bhāratamañjarī	Kṣemendra	Poem	C. 1050 A. D.
17. Dhanañjayavyāyoga	Kaṇcana- paṇḍita	Drama	C. 1100 A. D.
18. Kirātārjunīya- vyāyoga	Vatsaraja	„	1163 A. D.
19. Naiṣadhīyacarita	Śriharṣa	Poem	12th century A.D.
20. Nalavilāsa	Rāmacandra	Drama	C. 1200 A. D.
21. Nirbhyabhīma	„	„	„
22. Bālabhārata	Amaracandra	Poem	C. 1250 A. D.
23. Pāṇḍavacarita	Devaprabhasūri	„	„
24. Sahṛdayānanda	Kṛṣṇānanda	„	13th century A. D.
25. Bālabhārata	Agastya	„	C. 1300 A. D.
26. Pārthaparākrama	Prahlāda- nadeva	Drama	„
27. Bhīmavikrama	Mokṣāditya	„	„
28. Saugandhi-āharaṇa	Viśvanatha	„	C. 1350 A. D.
29. Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya	Vāsudeva	Poem	900-1400 A. D.
30. Nalodaya	„	„	„
31. Nalābhyndaya	Vāmanabhaṭṭa bāṇa	„	C. 1420 A. D.
32. Bhāratacampu	Anantabhaṭṭa	Campu	Before 1550 A. D.
33. Bhaimīpariṇaya	Srīnivāsa- dīkṣita	Drama	C. 1570 A. D.
34. Bhāratacampu	Rājacudāmani- dīkṣita	Campu	C. 1620 A. D.

Name of the work	Author	Type of the work	Date
35. Subhadrādhanañ-jaya	Gururāma	Drama	C. 1630 A. D.
36. Draupadīpariṇaya-campū	Cakrakavi	Campu	C. 1650 A. D.
37. Nalacarita	Nīlakaṇṭha-dikṣita	Drama	„
38. Subhadrāpariṇaya	Nallākavi	„	C. 1700 A. D.
39. Subhadrāharaṇa	Mdhava	„	not known

They are works like *Rāghav-ṛāṇḍarīya* which are based on both the epics.

INDEX

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Abhayacandra	195	Ādikarmapradīpa	225
Abhayadeva	84	Ādipurāṇa	61, 229
Abhayanandin	195	Advaitapariḥāṣā	248
Abhidhānacintāmaṇi	199	Advaitasiddhi	245, 248
Abhidhānaratnāmālā	199	Advaitavidyāvijaya	252
Abhidharmakośa	225	Āgamaprāmāṇya	251
Abhijñānaśākuntala	7, 61, 70, 133, 134, 137, 138, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 157, 265	Agastimata	217
Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi	107, 214, 217	Agastya	85, 117, 166, 187, 266
Abhinanda	80, 264	Aghoraśiva	256
Abhinavabhārati	170, 182, 183	Agnipurāṇa	59, 60, 62, 180, 218
Abhinavagupta	81, 94, 97, 170, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 214, 256, 257	Agniveśa	209, 210
Abhinavakālidāsa	119	Agniveśagr̥hyasūtra	34
Abhinayadarpaṇa	213	Ahobala	48
Abhisamayālaṅkāra-kārikā	225	Ahobila	215
Abhisārikabandhitaka	156	Aitareyabrāhmaṇa	24, 26, 102
Abhisārikavañcitaka	156	Aitareyāranyaka	25
Abhiṣekanāṭaka	142, 263	Aitareyopaniṣad	27, 29
Acyutaprekṣācārya	244	Ajayapāla	199
Acyutarāyābhyudaya	86, 174	Akalaṅka	228
Acyutaśataka	98	Ākhyātacandrikā	200
Acyutottara	181	Akṣobhyatirtha	244, 245
Adbhutabrāhmaṇa	25	Akutobhayā	225
Adbhutadarpaṇa	168, 264	Ālambanaparīksā	226
Adbhutasāgara	203	Alankāracūdāmaṇi	185, 187
Adbhutasītārāma stotra	99	Alankāra-karṇābharaṇa	187
Adhikaraṇasārāvali	251	Alankāra-kaustubha	187
Adhvaramīmāṃsā-kutuhala-vṛtti,	241	Alankārānusaṛiṇī	186
Ādhyarāja	110, 111	Alankāraratnākara	187
Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa	61	Alaṅkārasaṅgraha	186
		Alankārasārasaṅgraha	182, 186
		Alankārasarvasva	185
		Alankāraśekhara	187
		Alankāratilaka	186
		Alankāravamśa	181

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Alberuni	7, 218	Annambhaṭṭa	192, 233, 234, 240, 241, 248
Allaṭa (Alaka)	185	Annapūrṇādaśaka	97
Āloka	240	Annapūrṇāṣṭaka	97
Alvārs	250	Aṇubhāṣya	253
Amalānanda	248	Aṇubhūtiśvarūpācārya	196, 247
Amaracandra	84, 266	Anupadasūtra	34
Amarakośa see Nāmalingā-nuśāsana		Anustotrasūtra	34
Amarasimha	42, 66, 67, 199	Anuttarāṣṭikā	257
Amaru (Amaruka)	94	Anuvākānukramaṇī	35
Amaruśataka	95	Anuvyākhyāna	245
Amitagati	103, 229	Anyāpadeśaśataka	105
Amoghavṛtti	195	Anyāpohavicarakārikā	226
Amṛtakataka	48	Anyoktimuktālatā	104
Amṛtalaharī	99	Anyoktiśataka	105
Amṛtānanda	73	Āpadeva	241
Amṛtānandayogin	186	Aparārka	207
Amṛtatarangakāvya	81	Aparārka yājñavalkīyadharmasāstranibandha	207
Amṛtodaya	170	Aparokṣānubhūti	247
Ānanda	125	Āpastamba	23, 33, 34, 58, 70
Ānandagiri	247, 248	Āpastambadharmasūtra	206
Ānandakandacampū	120	Āpastambagrhyasūtra	33
Ānandamandākinī	99	Apohanāmaprakaraṇa	226
Anandarāghava	167, 264	Apohasiddhi	226
Ānandarāyamakhin	170	Appayadīkṣita	48, 56, 85, 87, 90, 99, 167, 187, 192, 200, 240, 241, 248, 252, 255
Anandasāgarastava	99	Āptamīmamsā	228
Anandasundarī	168	Arisimha	84
Ānandatirtha	18, 56, 61, 93, 244, 245	Arjunacaritamahākāvya	182
Anandavardhana	41, 78, 95, 97, 162, 163, 179, 182, 183	Arjunamiśra	56
Anangaharṣa Matrārāja	162	Arjunarāvaṇīya	76
Anangaranga	213	Arṇavavarṇana	83
Ananta	125	Ārṣānukramaṇī	35
Anantabhaṭṭa	119, 266	Arṣeyabrāhmaṇa	25, 35
Anargharāghava	163, 263, 264	Arṣeyakalpa	34
Anekārthakośa	199	Arthasangraha	241
Anekārthaśabdakośa	200	Arthaśāstra	213, 215, 216, 218
Anekārthasamuccaya	199	Āryabhaṭa	52, 68, 202, 204
Anekārthasangraha	199	Aryabhaṭīya	204
Angatvanirukti	239	Aryaka	156
Aniruddha	235, 250		

INDEX

271

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Aryāsaptasatī	107	Avantisundarīkathāsāra	114,
Aryasiddhānta	202		115, 151
Asanga	224, 225	Avatamsakasūtra	225
Āścaryacūdāmaṇi	159, 263	Avimāraka	144
Asitadevala	201	Bābhraṇya	212
Āśoka	4, 7	Bādarāyaṇa	230, 242
Aṣṭādhyāyī 1, 32, 131,	190	Bāhudantaka	215
191, 192, 194, 195,	196	Bāhyārthasiddhikārikā	226
Aṣṭamahāśrīcaityastotra	96	Bālabhārata	84, 85, 117, 163,
Aṣṭāṅgabṛdaya samhita	211		164, 25, 266
Aṣṭāṅgasangraha	211	Bālabodhini	196
Aṣṭapadī	95	Bālacandrasūri	84
Aṣṭasāhasrikāpāramita	225	Bālacarita	143
Asuri	235	Baladeva Upādhyāya	261
Āśvacikitsā	212	Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana	255
Āśvaghoṣa 3, 68, 69, 73, 76, 88,		Bālakrīḍā	207
89, 96, 124, 153, 169, 173	225	Bālaṃanoramā	193, 241
Āśvalāyana	22, 25, 34	Balamārtāṇḍavijaya	168, 175
Āśvamedhaparvan	51	Bālabhāṭṭa	207
Āśvaśāstra	212	Bālabhāṭṭi	207
Āśvavaidyaka	212	Bālarāmabharata	215
Āśvāyurveda	212	Balaramapancānana	196
Āśvinīkumāra	212	Balaramavarman	215
Atharvaparīśiṣṭa	34	Bālarāmāyaṇa	163, 164, 264
Atharvavedaprātīśkhyasūtra	31	Bālāvabodha	195
Atimānuṣastava	98	Ballālasena	125, 188, 203
Atmabodha	247	Bāna	54, 55, 62, 66, 74, 76, 80,
Atmasiddhi	251		81, 83, 96, 106, 110, 111,
Atmatattvaviveka	232, 234		112, 113, 114, 115, 116,
Atreya	209		117, 118, 119, 122, 123,
Atreyaśīkṣā	35		125, 141, 144, 149, 156,
Atri	250		157, 166, 173, 186, 188,
Atrisambhitā	250		207
Aucityavicāracarcā	81, 185, 188	Bānesvara	120, 175
Avadānakalpalatā	124	Bawddhadhikkāra	232
Avadānaśataka	80, 124, 131	Bandhāyana	205
Avaloka	184	Baudhāyanadharmasūtra	206
Avalokiteśvaragūṇa-		Bhadrabāhu	228
karāṇḍavyūha	225	Bhagavadajjuka	154
Avantisundarīkathā	76, 113,	Bhagavadgītā	7, 54, 150, 234,
114, 115, 116, 141, 142,			242, 243, 244, 245, 247,
150, 151, 180, 181			248, 249, 250, 251, 252,
			253, 254, 257

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Bhagavadgītābhāṣya	245, 247, 248, 251, 252	Bhartrhari	7, 78, 95, 102, 103, 104, 119, 191, 194, 247
Bhagavadgītārthasangraha	257	Bhartrharinirveda	167
Bhagavadgītātātparyanirṇaya	245	Bhartrmitra	239
Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa	251	Bhartrprapanca	247
Bhagavantabhāskara	208	Bhāsa	111, 114, 118, 119, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 151, 152, 154, 155, 156, 159, 263, 265
Bhāgavata	59, 60, 61, 62, 99, 119, 120, 143, 245, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255	Bhāṣāpariccheda	234
Bhāgavatacampu	119, 120	Bhāsarvajña	232
Bhāgavatasandarbhā	255	Bhāskara	138, 166, 204, 234, 241, 244, 253, 254, 264
Bhāgavatavyākhyā	245	Bhāskarācārya	202, 204, 237
Bhaimarathī	110	Bhāsvatī	204
Bhaimipariṇaya	167, 266	Bhāṣyabhāṇvabodhana	251
Bhairavānanda	167	Bhāṣyabhāṇvaprakāśikā	247
Bhaktāmarastotra	96	Bhāṣyadīpa	241
Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu	254	Bhāṣyaprakāśa	253
Bhallaṭa	104	Bhāṣyasūkti	234
Bhallaṭaśataka	104	Bhaṭṭabhāskara	18
Bhāmaha	143, 178, 181, 182, 197	Bhaṭṭacintāmaṇi	241
Bhāmahālaṅkāra	181, 182	Bhaṭṭadīpikā	241
Bhāmahā (laṅkāra) vivaraṇa	182	Bhaṭṭamalla	199
Bhāmatī	247, 248	Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa	134, 136, 158, 265
Bhāminīvilāsa	104	Bhaṭṭanāyaka	178, 180, 183
Bhandarkar R. G.	78, 95, 106, 107, 244	Bhaṭṭāraharicandra	6, 110, 111
Bhānudatta	186	Bhaṭṭarahasya	241
Bharadvāja	31, 34, 215	Bhaṭṭasāra	241
Bharata	130, 132, 177, 179, 181, 182, 186, 213, 214	Bhaṭṭataṇṭa	182, 183
Bhāratacampu	119, 120, 266	Bhaṭṭi	76, 78, 89, 263
Bhāratamanjari	81, 266	Bhaṭṭikāvya	78
Bharatārṇava	213	Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita	192, 193, 196, 208, 241, 248
Bhāratasamhitā	50	Bhaṭṭotpala	202, 203
Bharatasvāmin	18	Bhaṇmaka	76
Bhāratatātparyasangraha	255	Bhavabhūti	6, 79, 117, 119, 125, 135, 151, 155, 159, 161, 162, 163, 166, 180, 240, 263, 264
Bharataṭikā	179	Bhavadāsa	233
Bhāratīrtha	248		
Bhāravi	77, 78, 79, 80, 85, 89, 113, 114, 119, 128, 165, 265		

	Page.		Page.
Bhāvadīpikā	245	Bopadeva	196
Bhāvamiśra	212	Bopp, Francis	7
Bhāvanāpuruṣottama	170	Brahmā	59, 213, 250
Bhavanātha	241	Brahmagupta	204
Bhāvanāviveka	240	Brahmanandin	243, 250
Bhāvaprakāśa	212	Brahmānanda	257
Bhāvaprakāśana	137, 186	Brāhmaṇasarvasva	207
Bhāvaprakāśikā	245, 252, 253	Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa	59, 60, 61
Bhaviṣyapurāṇa	59, 60, 61	Brahmapurāṇa	59, 60, 61
Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa	61	Brahmasiddhi	97, 247, 248
Bhayabhāṇjana	203	Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta	204
Bhela	209	Brahmasūtra	242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255
Bhelasamhitā	211	Brahmasūtrabhāṣya	97, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 254, 255, 256
Bhikṣāṭanakāvya	86	Brahmasūtrabhāṣyatattva- prakāśikā	245
Bhīma	76, 89	Brahmasūtrabhāṣyavyākhyā	245
Bhīmaṭa	163	Brahmasūtrāṇubhāṣya	244
Bhīmavikrama	166, 266	Brahmasūtrāṇuvyākhyāna	245
Bhoganātha	107	Brahmavaivartapurāṇa	59, 60, 61
Bhoja	79, 80, 116, 118, 119, 163, 178, 184, 186, 192, 203, 204, 212, 216, 217, 236, 256, 263, 264,	Brahmavidyāvijaya	252
Bhojaprabandha	125, 188	Brhacchabdenduśekhara	193
Bhr̥gu	207, 250	Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad	24, 27, 29, 230
Bhr̥ngasandēśa	93	Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣadvārtika	247
Bhūdevaśukla	170	Brhadbhāgavatāmṛta	254
Bhūṣaṇa	48	Brhaddeśī	214
Bhūṣaṇabāṇa	113	Brhaddevatā	35, 104
Bhuvanābhyudaya	173, 183	Brhaddharmapurāṇa	62
Bījagaṇita	204	Brhadvivāhaphala	203
Bilhana	3, 81, 82, 89, 95, 165, 173, 174, 214	Brhadvṛtti	195
Bilvamangala	81, 98	Brhajjātaka	203
Bodhapancadaśikā	257	Brhannāradiya	60
Bodhasiddhi	232	Brhaspati	70, 202, 206, 215, 222
Bodhāyana	33, 68, 154, 204, 205, 239, 243, 250	Brhaspatismṛti	207
Bodhāyanapitṛmedhasūtra	34	Brhatī	239
Bodhicaryāvatāra	102, 226		
Bodhisattvācaryānirdeśa	225		
Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā	124		
Bohtlingk	108		

	Page.		Page.
Brhatkathā	81, 111, 112, 121, 122, 123, 128, 180	Candralekhā	168
Brhatkathāmanjarī	81, 121, 123, 124, 128	Candrāloka	186, 187
Brhatkathāslokaśaṅgraha	121, 123	Candraprabha	228
Brhatkathāsaritsāgara	124	Candraprabhacarita	84, 174
Brhatsamhitā	198, 203, 217, 218	Candraprabhasūri	84
Brhatsarvānukramaṇi	35	Cāndravvyākaraṇa	194
Brhaṭṭikā	239	Candrikā	183
Bud	127	Caraka	3, 23, 210, 211
Buddha	21, 63, 223, 224, 225	Carakasamhitā	210, 211
Buddhabhaṭṭa	217	Carāṇavyūha	34
Buddhacarita	69, 73, 89, 153	Cārāyaṇa	212
Buddhaghosa	76	Cārāyaṇīya	35
Budhabhūṣaṇa	108	Cārucaryā	103
Budhasvāmin	121, 122, 123	Cārudatta	144, 151, 152
Buhler	7, 74	Cārumati	110
Burzoe	127	Caturadāmodara	215
Caitanya, Śrī Kṛṣṇa	93, 98, 99, 108, 167, 196, 233, 244, 254	Cāturadhyāyikā	31
Caitanyacandrodaya	170	Caturdaṇḍiprakāśikā	215
Caitanyacaritāmṛta	255	Caturvargacintāmaṇi	208
Caitanyāmṛta	196	Caturvargasangraha	103
Cakrakavi	87, 120, 257, 264, 267	Catuśślokī	98, 251
Cakrapāṇidatta	212	Caurapancāśikā	95
Camatkāracandrikā	187	Chalitarāma	164
Campūrāmāyaṇa See Rāmāyaṇa-campū		Chandahsūtra	32, 65, 198
Cāṇakya	102, 215	Chāndogyabrāhmaṇa	25
Cāṇakyaśataka	102	Chāndogyapariśiṣṭa	34
Caṇḍakauśika	164	Chāndogyopaniṣad	25, 28, 29, 243
Caṇḍakavi	83	Chandomanjari	198
Caṇḍamāruta	252	Chandonukramaṇi	35
Caṇḍeśvara	208, 216	Chandonuśāsana	198
Caṇḍīśataka	96, 110	Chandovicitī	102, 116, 198
Candra	197	Chrysostom Rhetor Dion	53
Candradūta	93	Cidambara	80, 87, 120
Candragomin	194	Cikitsākalikā	212
Candrakalānāṭikā	186	Cikitsāmṛta	212
		Cikitsāsāra	211, 212
		Cintāmaṇi	208
		Citrabhārata	165
		Citracampū	120, 175
		Citrādvaitasiddhi	226
		Citramīmāṃsā	187
		Citramīmāṃsākhaṇḍana	187

	Page.		Page.
Citrapaṭa	241	Devavimalagaṇi	88, 175
Citsukha	245, 247, 248	Devendrasūri	195
Colebrooke	7	Devībhāgavata	62
Ākṣiṇāmūrtyaṣṭaka	97	Devicandragupta	156
Dāmaka	154	Devīmāhātmya	61
Damaruka	168	Devīśataka	97, 182
Damayantīkathā	118	Dhammapāda	102, 224
Dāmodaragupta	103, 162	Dhananjaya	80, 88, 89, 122, 184, 199
Dāmodaramiśra	163, 198	Dhananjayavyāyoga	165, 266
Dānakelikaumudī	167	Dhanapāla	113, 117, 123, 200, 217
Dandin	6, 76, 77, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 122, 123, 125, 141, 142, 144, 150, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 184, 188, 215	Dhanika	164, 184
Daridrācārudatta	140, 151, 152	Dhanvantari	66, 67
Darpadalana	103	Dhanvantarinighaṇṭu	212
Darśanaśuddhi	228	Dharmābhyudaya	170
Daśabhūmiśvara	225	Dharmabindu	228
Daśagītikāsūtra	204	Dharmadāsa	113, 188
Daśakumāracarita	114, 115, 116, 123, 180, 215	Dharmakīrti	192, 226
Daśamukhavadhā	75	Dharmākūta	48
Daśarathajāta	43	Dharmaparīkṣā	103, 229
Daśarūpa	184	Dharmarājādhvarin	248
Daśarūpāvaloka	164	Dharmaratna	207
Daśaślokī	247, 248, 253	Dharmasangraha	225
Daśavaikālikaniryukti	228	Dharmaśarmābhyudaya	79, 118
Daśavaikālikasūtra	228	Dharmavijayanāṭaka	170
Daśāvatāracarita	81	Dharmottara	226
Dattaka	154, 157, 213	Dhātupāṭha	190
Dattakalasi	153	Dhātuvṛtti Mādhavīya	193
Dattila	213	Dhīranāga	154, 155
Dayāpāla	195	Dhoyi	93, 95
Deśināmamālā	200	Dhṛḍhabala	210
Devanandin Puḥyapāda	191, 195	Dhūrtanartaka	168
Devanṇabhaṭṭa	207	Dhūrtasamāgama	166
Devaprabhasūri	84, 266	Dhūrtaviṭasamvāda	154
Devarāja	168, 175	Dhvanyāloka	41, 182, 183
Devasūri	228	Dhvanyālokalocana	182, 183, 257
Devatādhyāyabrāhmaṇa	25	Dīdhiti	223, 234
Devatānukramaṇi	35	Diñnāga	40, 41, 67, 154, 155, 226, 232, 263
		Dīpankara	212
		Dīpaśikhāpañcikā	240
		Dīpavamśa	224

	Page.		Page.
Dīpikā	48	Gangāvaméānucarita	119, 175
Dirghāgama	224	Gangāvatarāṇa	87
Divyaprabandha	250	Gangeśa	233
Divyāvadāna	124	Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha	204
Drāhyāyaṇa	34	Garga	201
Dramiḍācārya	243, 250	Gārgīsamhitā	201
Draupadīpariṇayacampū	120, 267	Gārgya	32, 202
Drṣṭāntaśataka	104	Garuḍadaṇḍaka	98
Duhkhabhañjanakavi	198	Garuḍapurāṇa	59, 60, 61
Durgasimha	195	Gāthāsangraha	225
Durghaṭavṛtti	192	Gāthāsaptāśati	67, 106, 107
Durlabharāja	203	Gauḍapāda	235, 247
Durvinīta	113, 114, 122	Gauḍavaho	79, 116, 173
Dūtaghaṭotkaca	143, 265	Gauḍorvīśakulaprasastī	83
Dūtāṅgada	170	Gautama	4, 6, 13, 58, 60, 69, 76, 206, 210, 222, 230, 232, 260
Dūtavākya	143, 265	Ghanaśyāma	168
Dvādaśasāhasri	213	Ghaṭakarpara	66, 67, 94
Dvādaśastotra	98	Ghaṭakarparakulakavivṛti	183
Dvātrimśatputtalikā	125	Gheraṇḍasamhitā	237
Dvisandhāna	116	Gītagovinda	95, 98, 254
Dvyāśrayakāvya	82, 174	Gītārthasaṅgraha	245, 251, 252
Dyādviveda	104	Gītārthasaṅgraharakṣā	252
Ekāvali	187	Gobhila	34
Fahien	7	Gobhilagr̥hyasūtra	33, 34
Fleet	74	Gobhilaputra	34
Gadādhara	233, 234	Gode P. K.	218
Gadyacintāmaṇi	117	Goethe	7, 149
Gadyatraya	98, 251, 252, 257	Gokulanātha	167, 170
Gaṇa	212	Gola	204
Gaṇapāṭha	193	Gonardīya	212
Gaṇapatiśāstri	140, 141	Gopālabhaṭṭa	255
Gaṇḍavyūha	225	Gopālakelikrīḍā	169
Gandhahastimahābhāṣya	228	Gopathabrāhmaṇa	25, 26
Gandharvaprārthanāṣṭaka	99	Gopeśvara	253
Gāṇḍistotragāthā	96	Gopīnātha cakravartin	169
Gangādāsa	198	Gorakṣaśataka	237
Gangādāsapratāpavilāsa	167, 175	Govardhana	95, 107, 113
Gaṅgādevī	85, 166, 174	Govindabhagavatpāda	247
Gangādhara	167, 175	Govindabbāṣya	255
Gangālaharī	99	Govindābhiseka	81
Gangāstava	98		

	PAGE		PAGE.
Govindadīkṣita	87, 167, 214, 215, 240	Haribhadrāsūri	228, 229, 258
Govindalīlāmṛta	255	Haribhaktivilāsa	255
Govindarāja	48	Haribhāskara	108
Goyīcandra	196	Haricandra	79, 118, 188
Goyīcandrikā	196	Haridīkṣita	193
Grahagaṇita	204	Harihara	167
Grassmann	7	Harikavi	108
Gr̥hyasangraha-pariśiṣṭa	34	Harilīlā	61
Grierson	122	Harināmāmṛta	196
Grimm	7	Haripāla	214
Gr̥tsamada	18	Harīṣeṇa	74, 110
Gūḍbārthadīpikā	248	Harīsvāmin	18
Guhadeva	250	Hārīta	209
Gumāni	104	Hārītadharmasūtra	206
Guṇabhadra	118, 229	Harivamsa (purāṇa)	49, 51, 55, 58, 62, 131, 143, 229
Guṇacandra	213	Harivijaya	182
Guṇādhyā	81, 112, 114, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 195	Harivilāsa	86
Guṇaratna	229	Harṣa, (Harṣadeva, Harṣa- vardhana)	58, 96, 110, 111, 135, 151, 155, 157, 158, 168, 173, 177, 180, 193
Gurūpasattivijaya	252	Harṣacarita	76, 106, 110, 111, 112, 114, 116, 141, 150, 173, 186
Gururāma	167, 267	Harṣacaritavārtika	186
Haimalaghunyāsa	195	Harṣakīrtisūri	203
Hāla	106	Hastigiricampu	120
Halāyudha	76, 80, 89, 199, 207	Hāsyacūḍamaṇi	165
Hammīramadamardana	166, 174	Hāsyārṇava	169
Hammīramahākāvya	84	Haṭhayogapradīpikā	237
Hamsadūta	93	Hayagrīvavadha	75
Hamsasandēśa	93	Heine Heinrich	91
Hanumān	163, 264	Hemacandra	82, 89, 103, 125, 129, 165, 173, 174, 185, 188, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 213, 216, 228, 229,
Hanumannāṭaka	163	Hemādri	208
Haracaritacintāmaṇi	83	Herder	7
Haradatta	192	Hetubinduvivarāṇa	226
Haradattācārya	255	Hetucakra	226
Haradattasūri	80, 88		
Haragaurīvivāha	167, 215		
Harakelināṭaka	165		
Hārāvali	199		
Haravijaya	79, 89, 97, 163		
Haravilāsa	164		
Harī	239		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Hieun-Thsang	3, 7, 155, 157, 218	Jaiminiyabrāhmaṇa	26
Hiranyakeśin	23, 34	Jaiminiyanyāyamālā	241
Hīrasaubhagya	88, 175	Jainarājataranginī	86
Hitopadeśa	4, 127, 129	Jalhana	82, 103, 107, 112, 174
Homer	43	Jambhaladatta	124
Horāśāstra	203	Jānakīharaṇa	76, 263
Horāṣaṭpancāśikā	203	Jānakīnātha	233
Hṛdayadarpaṇa	183	Jānakīpariṇaya	87, 168, 264
Hume R. E.	27	Janāśraya	102, 198
Iliad	43, 49	Jātakamālā	124, 224
Indra	215	Jaya	50, 51, 52, 58, 59
Indradatta	190	Jayadatta	212
Indurāja	182	Jayaddhara	196
Irugappadaṇḍanātha	200	Jayadeva	95, 98, 165, 186, 187, 213, 254, 264
Īśāvāsyopaniṣadbhāṣya	252	Jayāditya	181, 191
Īsopaniṣad	23, 28, 29	Jayākyasamhitā	250
Īṣṭasiddhi	248	Jayamangala	213
Īśvarabhangakārikā	226	Jayantabhaṭṭa	80, 232
Īśvaradatta	154	Jayantavijaya	84, 174
Īśvaragītā	62	Jayaprabhasūri	166
Īśvarakṛṣṇa	235	Jayaratha	83
Īśvarasamhitā	250	Jayasimhasūri	166
Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā	257	Jayatīrtha	245
Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikāvṛtti	257	Jespersion	7
Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī	257	Jīmutavāhana	207
Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī	257	Jinadāsa	229
Īśvarasiddhi	251, 257	Jinasena	93, 229
Itsing	7, 191, 211	Jinendrabuddhi	78, 181, 191, 195
Jacobi	43	Jīvagosvamin	187, 196, 255
Jagaddeva	203	Jīvakacintāmaṇi	117
Jagadīśa	169, 233, 234	Jīvānandana	170
Jagadūcarita	84, 174	Jīvandharacampu	118
Jagajjyotirmalla	167, 215	Jīvanmuktiviveka	248
Jagannāthapaṇḍita	99, 104, 108, 187, 193	Jñānanidhi	159
Jaimini	34, 51, 230, 238, 239, 242, 243	Jñānaśrī	226
		Jñānendrasarasvati	193
		Joad. C. E. M.	135, 150, 216, 217
		Jonarāja	86, 106, 125, 174

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Jones William	7	Kāmadhenu	196
Jūmaranandin	196	Kāmakalā	257
Jyotirīśvara	166, 213	Kamalā	168
Jyotirvidābharāṇa	66, 67, 202	Kamalākarabhaṭṭa	208, 240
Jyotiṣasāroddhāra	203	Kamalaśīla	226, 258
Jyotiṣavedāṅga	32	Kamalinīkalahamsanāṭaka	167
Kādambarī 55, 80, 81, 110, 111,		Kāmandaka	129, 216
112, 113, 114, 115, 116,		Kāmasūtra	75, 88, 154, 157,
117, 119, 156, 166			188, 212, 213
Kādambarīkalyāṇa	166	Kamban	48
Kādambarīkathā āra	80	Kambarāmāyaṇa	48
Kaiyaṭa	192, 193	Kamsavadha	167
Kālamādhaviya	208	Kaṇāda	230, 232
Kalāpariccheda	116	Kaṇādarahasya	234
Kālāpasamhitā	23	Kanakadhārāstava	97
Kalāvilāsa	103	Kanakajānakī	165
Kalhaṇa	82, 86, 89, 172, 173,	Kanakalekhākalyāṇa	167
	174	Kanakasenavādirāja	80, 173
Kalidāsa, 6, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67,		Kāncanapaṇḍita (Kāncanācārya)	165, 266
68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76,			
77, 81, 84, 85, 88, 91, 92,		Kandarpacūḍāmaṇi	213
93, 94, 96, 111, 113, 114,		Kane P. V.	207
117, 119, 125, 128, 131,		Kapila	60, 63, 230, 234, 235
134, 135, 136, 140, 141,		Kapiṣṭhalakāṭhasamhitā	23
142, 144, 145, 146, 147,		Kappaṇābhyudaya	80, 89
148, 149, 150, 151, 153,		Karaṇakutūhala	204
155, 156, 160, 161, 162,		Kardamarāja	117
179, 188, 198, 202, 263,		Kārikavalī	234
265		Karmapradīpa	34
Kālikāpurāṇa	62	Karmapuṇḍarika	225
Kalividāmbana	104	Karṇabhāra	143, 265
Kallaṭa	256, 257	Karṇasundarī	165, 173
Kalpadru	200	Karṇīsuta	217
Kalpanāmaṇḍitaka	124, 224	Karpaṭa	156
Kalpānupāda	34	Karpūracarita	165
Kalpataru	248	Karpūramañjarī	138, 163
Kalyāṇamalla	213	Karpūravartikā	240
Kalyāṇamandirastotra	96	Karuṇālaharī	99
Kalyāṇarakṣita	226	Kāryakāraṇabhāvasiddhi	226
Kalyāṇasaugandhika	169	Kāśikā	240
Kāmadatta	153	Kāśikāvivarāṇapañjikā	191

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Kāśikāvṛtti	76, 78, 181, 191, 192, 195,	Kāvyakautukavivarāṇa	182
Kāśikhanda	62	Kāvyāṅkārā	184
Kāśīpatikavirāja	167	Kāvyāṅkārāsūtra	180, 216
Kāśyapa	195, 206, 209, 250	Kāvyālokalocana	183
Kāśyapasamhitā	211	Kāvyamīmamsā	184, 188
Kātantravyākaraṇa	195	Kāvyanirṇaya	184
Kāṭhakagr̥hyasūtra	34	Kāvyānuśāsana	186, 186
Kāṭhakasamhitā	23	Kāvyaprakāśa	185, 186, 187, 188
Kathākautuka	125	Kedārabhaṭṭa	198
Kathārṇava	125	Keilhorn	7
Kathāsaritsāgara	121, 122, 124, 128, 190	Keith A. B.	89, 127, 177
Kāṭhopeniṣad	28, 29	Kenopanīṣad	25, 28, 29
Kātyāyana	1, 31, 34, 35, 65, 190, 191, 197, 198, 199, 223	Keśavācārya	253
Kātyāyanaśrāddhakalpa	34	Keśavadaivajña	200
Kaumudimahotsava	156, 173	Keśavakāśmirin	253
Kaumudimitrānanda	165	Keśavamīśra	187, 233
Kauśīkasūtra	34	Keśavasvāmin	199
Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa	24, 26	Khādira	34
Kauṣītakyaṛaṇyaka	25	Khaṇḍadeva	241
Kauṣītakyaupanīṣad	27, 29	Khaṇḍakhādyaka	204
Kaustubhaprabhā	253	Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya	83, 248
Kauṭilya	215, 216	Kīcakavādha	79, 265
Kautukaratnākara	168	Kiraṇāvalī	232
Kautukasarvasva	169	Kirātārjunīya	77, 78, 89, 113, 122, 265
Kavi M. R.	102	Kirātārjunīyavyāyoga	165, 266
Kavikalpadruma	196	Kīrtikaumudī	119, 174
Kavikaṇṭhābharāṇa	185, 188	Koḍaṇḍamaṇḍana	216
Kavikarṇapūra	170	Kohala	214
Kavindravacanasamuccaya	107	Kokasandeśa	93
Kaviputra	140, 141, 145	Kokilasandeśa	93, 167
Kavirahasya	76, 80	Kokkoka	213
Kavirāja	80, 83, 88, 89, 117	Koṇḍubhaṭṭa	193
Kavitārka	168	Kramadīśvara	196
Kāvyadarpaṇa	187	Kratuśaṅgraha	34
Kāvyādarśa	109, 112, 114, 115, 116, 118, 123, 180, 181, 188	Kṛṣṇābhyudaya	169
Kāvyakautuka	182, 183	Kṛṣṇacandra	253
		Kṛṣṇacarita	117
		Kṛṣṇadāsakavirāja	255

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana	49	Kuntaka	178, 183, 184
Kṛṣṇakarnāmṛta	98	Kunteśvaradautya	150
Kṛṣṇakavi	120	Kuppuswami Sastri S.	97
Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka	81, 98, 197	Kūrmapurāṇa	59, 60, 62
Kṛṣṇalīlātarangiṇī	99	Kusumadeva	104
Kṛṣṇamiśra	169	Kuṭṭinīmata	103
Kṛṣṇānanda	83, 233, 257	Kuvalayānanda	187
	266	Kuvalayāśvacarita	186
Kṛṣṇatatācārya	241		
Kṛṣṇāvadhūta		Laghīyastraya	228
Ghaṭikāśatakavi	169	Laghubbhāgavatāmṛta	254
Kṛṣṇavilāsa	86	Laghubbhāskarīya	204
Kṛtakoti	243	Laghujātaka	203
Kṣaṇabhangasiddhi	226	Laghumanjūṣā	193
Kṣapaṇaka	66, 67	Laghuśabdenduśekhara	193
Kṣatracūdāmaṇi	117	Laghusiddhāntakaumudī	193
Kṣemaṇkara	125	Laghvarhannīti	216
Kṣemarāja	257	Laghvī (Vivarāṇa)	239, 240
Kṣemendra	81, 92, 103, 121,	Lakṣaṇāvalī	232
	122, 123, 124, 150, 161,	Lakṣmaṇa	119
	164, 179, 185, 188, 198,	Lakṣmaṇasena	203
	264, 266	Lakṣmīdevī	207
Kṣemiśvara	164, 266	Lakṣmīdhara	197, 207
Kṣīrasamudravāsimiśra	241	Lakṣmīlaharī	99
Kṣutrasūtra	34	Lakṣmīnṛsimhastotra	97
Kulasekhara	97	Lakṣmīśahasra	99
Kulaśekhara Alvar	97	Lakṣmīvyākhyāna	207
Kulaśekhara varman	162, 265	Lakulīśa	255
Kullūkabhaṭṭa	207	Lalitamādhava	167
Kumāradāsa	76, 77, 89, 263	Lalitātriśatībhāṣya	257
Kumaralabdha	223	Lalitavigrabarājanāṭaka	165
Kumaralāta	124, 224	Lalitavistara	224
Kumārāpālacarita	82	Lalla	202
Kumārasambhava	68, 69, 70, 71,	Lankāvatārasūtra	225
	72, 150, 167, 201	Lankeśvara	197
Kumārīlabhaṭṭa	54, 102, 159,	Lassen	44
	228, 239, 240, 247 260	Laṭakamelaka	165
Kumbhakarna	214	Likhita	206
Kumudvatīprakaraṇa	153	Līlāvatī	204
Kundamālā	41, 67, 154, 263	Liṅgānuśāsana	191, 192, 193
Kunhan Raja C.	191	Liṅgānuśāsanavṛtti	192

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Lingapurāṇa	59, 60, 62	Mahābhāratatātparyanirṇaya	56, 245
Lokanāthabhaṭṭa	169	Mahābhāratatātparyasangraha	56
Lolambaraja	86, 212	Mahābhāskariya	204
Lollaṭa	177, 183	Mahābhāṣya	110, 191, 192, 213
Macdonell A. A.	13, 14, 32, 45	Mahābhāṣyadīpikā	191
	7, 149, 162, 260	Mahābhāṣyapradīpa	193
Madālasācampū	118	Mahābhāṣyapradīpodyota	193
Madana	166	Mahācārya	252
Madanagopalavilāsa	167	Mahādeva	168, 264
Madanapāla	212	Mahāārāyaṇīyopanīṣad	28, 29
Madanapārijāta	208	Mahānāṭaka	137, 163, 264
Madanasanjīvana	168	Mahāpuruṣanirṇaya	251
Madanavinodanighaṇṭu	212	Mahāvastu	224
Mādhava	18, 169, 208, 267	Mahāvīra	4, 195, 226, 228
Mādhavācārya	62, 193, 207, 208	Mahāvīracarita	159, 161, 163, 166, 263
	214, 241, 248,		
Mādhavabhaṭṭa	18	Mahāvīrācārya	204
Mādhavakara	211	Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda	225
Mādhavānalakathā	125	Mahāyānasūtrāṅkārasūtra	225
Mādhavatīrtha	244	Mahāyānavimśaka	225
Madhumathanavijaya	79	Mahendra	117
Madhusūdana	163	Mahendravikraman	138, 154, 156, 173
Madhusūdanasarasvati	99, 245, 248		
Madhva	98, 244, 245	Maheśvara	199
Madhyamāgama	224	Maheśvaratīrtha	48
Madhyamavyāyoga	143, 265	Mahīdāsa (Mahīdhara)	18
Mādhyaṃmikakārikā (sūtra)	225	Mahimabhaṭṭa	80, 179, 183, 186
Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī	193	Mahimnastava	97
Māgha	78, 79, 80, 85, 89, 118, 119, 125, 128, 265	Mahopadeśavimśatikā	257
Mahābhārata	19, 21, 36, 38, 40, 41, 45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 77, 81, 84, 89, 102, 126, 134, 142, 147, 158, 164, 177, 198, 206, 207, 215, 229, 230, 235, 243, 250, 255, 261, 264, 265	Maitrāyaṇīsambhitā	23
		Maitrāyaṇīyopanīṣad	28, 29
		Maitreyaṇātha	224, 225
		Mālājī	204
		Mālatīmādhava	136, 137, 138, 159, 160, 161, 162, 167
		Mālavikāgnimitra	70, 131, 135, 136, 140, 141, 145, 148, 149, 157, 163, 164
		Mālinīvijayavārtika	257

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Mallikāmāruta	167	Mathurānātha	233
Mallinātha	77, 78	Mathurāvijaya	85, 86, 166, 174
Malliṣeṇa	229	Mātrgupta	180
Mammata	185, 188	Matsyapurāṇa	59, 60, 62, 260
Mānameyodaya	258	Mattavilāsaprahasana	138, 141, 154, 156, 173
Mānameyodayarahasyaśloka- vārtika	258	Max Muller	7, 12, 15, 73, 261, 262
Mānasāra	217	Mayamata	217
Mānasollāsa	107, 214	Mayūkhamālikā	240
Mānatunga	96	Mayūkhāvali	240
Mānavadharmasāstra	206	Mayūra	96, 114, 119, 157, 188
Mānavaśrāddhakalpa	34	Māyurāja	106, 162
Maṇḍana	217	Medhātithi	207
Maṇḍanamisra	97, 194, 239, 240, 247, 248	Medhāvin	180, 181
Mandāramarandacampu	120	Medinīkara	200
Māṇḍūkyakārikā	247	Megasthenes	7, 52, 215
Māṇḍūkyopanīṣad	28, 29, 247	Meghadūta see Meghasandēśa	
Maṇika	167	Meghanādāri	251
Māṇikyanandin	228	Meghaprabhācārya	170
Manjūṣā	193	Meghapratisandēśa	93
Mankha	82, 89, 186, 188, 199	Meghasandēśa	66, 67, 70, 75, 91, 92, 93, 160
Manmathonmathana	168	Meghavijayagaṇi	80, 88, 128, 195
Manodūta	94	Menṭha	6, 75, 119
Manoramā	197	Merutunga	175, 188
Manoramāvatsarāja	163	Milhana	212
Manovatī	110	Mīmāṃsākaustubha	241
Mantrabrāhmaṇa	33	Mīmāṃsāmakaranda	241
Mantrapāṭha	33	Mīmāṃsānukramaṇikā	240
Mantrarahasyādhyāya	35	Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa	241
Manu	58, 70, 207, 215,	Mīmāṃsāpādukā	251, 252
Manusmṛti	7, 33, 206, 207	Mīmāṃsāsūtra	239, 241, 242, 252
Marīci	250	Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya	239
Mārkaṇḍeya	197	Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣyapariśiṣṭa	240
Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa	59, 60, 61	Mīnarāja Yavanācārya	203
Maśakakalpasūtra	34	Mitākṣarā	207, 248
Mātanga	214		
Mātangadivākara	157		
Mātangalīlā	212		
Māṭharavṛtti	235		
Mathurādāsa	169		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Mitramiśra	120, 208	Nānārtharatnamālā	199, 200
Mohamudgara	103	Nānārthārṇavasamkṣepa	199
Mohaparājaya	169, 174	Nandikeśvara (Nandi)	179, 213
Mokṣāditya	166, 266	Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa	187
Mṛcchakatika	134, 135, 137, 138, 144, 151, 152, 156	Nānyadeva	214
Mṛgāṅkalekhanāṭikā	168	Nārada	179, 201, 214, 250
Mudītamacālasā	167	Nārada purāṇa	59, 60
Mudrārākṣasa	137, 155, 156	Nārada smṛti	207
Mudritakumudacandra	165, 174	Nārada sūtra	250
Mugdhabodha	196	Narahari	203, 212
Mugdhopadeśa	103	Naraharitīrtha	244
Mūka	97	Narapatijayacaryāśvarodaya	203
Mūkapañcāśatī	97	Narasimha	166, 169
Mukundamālā	97	Narasimha purāṇa	62
Mukundamuktāvali	99	Narasimhavijaya	186
Mukundānanda	167	Nārāyaṇa	114, 119, 129, 212, 217
Mukutātādītaka	110, 157	Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa	85, 99, 119, 192 240, 258
Mūlabhāvaprakāśikā	251	Nārāyaṇatīrtha	99
Mūladeva	217	Nārāyaṇavilāsa	167
Muṇḍakopaniṣad	28, 29	Nārāyaṇīya	85, 99, 192, 240
Murāri	82, 163, 263, 264	Narendra	196
Murārimiśra	239	Nartananirṇaya	214
Muthusvāmidīkṣita	100	Nāṭakamīmāṃsā	186
Nāgānanda	110, 133, 135, 137, 157, 158, 177	Nāthamuni	250
Nāgārjuna	211, 212, 218, 224, 225, 226, 232	Nāṭyadarpaṇa	213
Nāgeśabhaṭṭa	192, 193, 194, 207	Nāṭyārṇava	213
Naiṣadhbānanda	164, 266	Nāṭyaśāstra	62, 132, 137, 177, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 213, 214
Naiṣadhīyacarita	83, 248, 266	Nāṭyaveda	130
Naiṣkarmyasiddhi	83, 247, 248	Nāṭyavedāgama	213
Nakula	212	Navagrahacarita	168
Nalābhyudaya	86, 117, 266	Navamālikā	168
Nalacampū	118, 266	Nāvanītaka	211
Nalacarita	167, 267	Navaratnaparikṣā	217
Nalavilāsa	165, 266	Navasāhasāṅkacarita	81, 173
Nallākavi	168, 267	Nayacandra	84
Nalodaya	84, 85, 266	Nayadyum ni	251
Nāmalingānuśāsana	42, 67, 199		
Nāmamālā	199		
Nāmasangrahamālā	200		

	PAGE		PAGE
Nāyakarātna	240	Nyāyabinduṭīkā	226
Nayamaṇimālā	255	Nyāyakalikā	232
Nayamañjarī	248	Nyāyakandalī	229, 232
Nayamayūkhamālikā	252	Nyāyakaṇikā	85, 240
Nayaprakāśikā	251	Nyāyakhaṇḍakhādya	229
Nayaviveka	241	Nyāyakulīśa	251
Nemiduta	93	Nyāyakumudacandrodaya	228
Neminirvāṇa	82	Nyāyakusumāñjali	232
Nibandha	239, 240	Nyāyalīlāvati	232, 233
Nibandhana	240	Nyāyamanjarī	232
Nidānasūtra	32, 34, 198	Nyāyāmṛta	245, 248
Nighaṇṭusamaya	199	Nyāyāmṛtataranginī	229
Nighaṇṭuśeṣa	199	Nyāyamuktāvalī	245
Nikṣeparakṣā	251	Nyāyanirṇaya	247
Nīlakaṇṭha	56, 169, 203, 208	Nyāyapadma	241
Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita	87, 99, 104, 105, 120, 167, 267	Nyāyapariśiṣṭa	232
Nīlakaṇṭhaviṇaya	120	Nyāyapariśuddhi	251
Nīlamatapurāṇa	62, 174	Nyāyapradīpa	229
Nimbārka	244, 253	Nyāyapraveśa	226
Nirbhayaśāstra	165, 266	Nyāyarahasya	229
Nirṇayasindhu	208, 240	Nyāyarakṣamaṇi	248
Nirukta	18, 19, 31, 32, 190, 199, 207	Nyāyaratnākara	240
Nītidviśaṣṭika	102	Nyāyaratnamālā	240, 241
Nītimanjarī	104	Nyāyasangraha	248
Nītiprakāśikā	216	Nyāyasāra	232
Nītiratnākara	216	Nyāyasiddhāñjana	249, 251, 252
Nītisāra	129, 216	Nyāyasiddhāntamanjarī	233
Nītisāta	102, 103, 104	Nyāyasūcīnibandha	232
Nītivākyāmṛta	216	Nyāyasudarśana	251
Nītiśāstra	79, 265	Nyāyasudhā	240, 245
Nitya	251	Nyāyasūtra	231, 232, 234
Nityanātha	212	Nyāyatattva	251
Nṛpatunga	78, 180	Nyāyavārtika	232
Nṛsiṃhakavi (Abhinavakālidāsa)	187	Nyāyavārtikatātparyatīkā	232
Nyāsa	78, 181, 191, 196	Nyāyāvātāra	228
Nyāśakāra	181	Nyāyāvātāravivṛti	228
Nyāyabhāṣya	232	Nyāyaviniścaya	228
Nyāyabindu	226	Oḍayadeva	117
		Oḍyssey	49
		Pācakaakevali	203
		Padamanjarī	192

	PAGE		PAGE
Padānukramaṇi	35	Pāṇḍavacarita	84, 266
Padārthadharmasangraha	232	Pāṇḍavānanda	164
Padārthakhaṇḍana	233	Pāṇḍavapurāṇa	229
Pādatāditaka	156	Pandey K. C.	94, 182, 256
Padmagupta	66, 81, 173	Pāṇini 1, 2, 3, 4, 32, 46, 64, 70,	131, 141, 153, 188, 190,
Padmanābhabhaṭṭa	196	191, 192, 193, 194, 195,	196, 198
Padmanābhatīrtha	244	Pāṇiniivādanakṣatramālā	192
Padmapāda	247, 248	Pāṇiniīyasīkṣā	35
Padmaprābhṛtaka	153	Pañjikā	229
Padmapurāṇa	59, 60, 61, 229	Paralokasiddhi	226
Pādmāsambhitā	250	Paramalaghumanjūṣā	193
Pādukāśahasra	98	Paramārtha	226
Padyacūdāmaṇi	76	Paramārthacarcā	257
Padyakādambarī	81	Paramārthadvādaśikā	257
Padyāmṛtatīranginī	108	Paramārthasaptati	226
Padyāvalī	108	Paramārthasāra	257
Paila	51	Parameśvara	85
Paitāmahasiddhānta	201	Pārameśvara	250
Paithīnasī	206	Parāśara 49, 59, 60, 201, 208,	215, 242
Paiyālacchi	200	Parāśarabhaṭṭa	98, 251
Pañcadaṇḍacchatraprabandha	125	Parāśarasmṛti	207
Pañcadaśī	217, 248	Parāśaryavijaya	252
Pañcākhyānaka	128	Pāraśava	156
Pañcākhyānoddhara	128	Pāraskara	34
Pañcapādikā	247, 248	Parāśurāma	257
Pañcapādikāvivarana	248	Parāśurāmakalpasūtra	257
Pañcaprakriyā	248	Parātrimśikāvivarana	257
Pancaparākrama	225	Paribhāṣenduśekhara	193
Pancarātra	142, 145, 265	Pārijātaḥaraṇa	83
Pancarātrarakṣā	251	Pārijātaḥaraṇacampu	120
Pancasāyaka	213	Pārijātamanjarī	166
Pancasiddhāntikā	202	Parikaravijaya	252
Pancasikha	235	Parikṣāmukhaśūtra	228
Pancastava	98	Parimala	66, 81, 245, 248
Pancatantra	4, 127, 128, 129	Parīśiṣṭaparvan	129, 229
Pancavastu	195	Pārsīprakāśa	200, 204
Pancavidhasūtra	31	Pārsvābhyudaya	93
Pancavimśabrāhmaṇa	24, 25, 26	Pārsvadeva	214
Pancikā	245		
Pāṇḍavābhyudaya	170		

	PAGE		PAGE
Pārśvanātha	227	Prakāśa	233, 240
Pārthaparākrama	166, 266	Prakāśātman	248
Pārīhasārathimiśra	240, 241	Prakaṭārtthavivarāṇa	247
Pārvatīpariṇaya	167	Prakīrṇakavivarāṇa	257
Paśupatiśūtra	255	Prakriyākaumudī	192
Pātālaviṇaya	64	Prakriyā-angraha	195
Pātanjabhāṣyavārtika	236	Prakriyā-sarvasva	192
Patañjali 1, 2, 3, 22, 23	64, 70,	Prākṛtacchandahśūtra	198
88, 110, 116, 126, 131,	188	Prākṛtakalpataru	197
191, 192, 194, 210,	230,	Prākṛtakāmadhenu	197
23		Prākṛtalakṣaṇa	197
Patanjalicarita	88	Prākṛtaprakāśa	182, 196, 197
Pathyāpathyanighaṇṭu	212	Prākṛtaprakāśavṛtti	197
Pauṣkara	250	Prākṛtarūpāvatāra	197
Pauṣkaraśādin	32, 201	Prākṛtasabdānuśāsana	197
Pavanadūta	93	Prākṛtasarvasva	197
Peddibhaṭṭa	108	Prākṛtasūtra	197
Phalaikatvavāda	241	Prākṛtasūtravṛtti	197
Phitsūtra	193	Prākṛtavyākaraṇasūtra	197
Pingala (nāga)	32, 65, 198	Pramāṇalakṣaṇa	245, 248
Piṭakas	72, 210, 224	Pramāṇamīmāṃsā	228
Pīyūṣalaharī	99	Pramāṇanayatattvālokāṅkāra	228
Potayārya	107		
Prabandhacintāmaṇi	175, 188	Pramāṇapaddhati	245
Prabandhaśoṣa	175	Pramāṇaparīkṣā	226
Prabhacandra	228	Pramāṇasamuccaya	226
Prabhākara	239, 240, 241	Pramāṇavārtikakārikā	226
Prabhāvakacarita	84	Pramāṇavārtikaṭikā	226
Prabhāvatī	186	Pramāṇavidbhvamsana	225
Prabodhacandrikā	196	Pramāṇaviniścaya	226
Prabodhacandrodaya	169	Pramāṇaviniścayaṭikā	226
Prabuddharauhiṇya	166	Prameyadīpikā	245
Pracandapāṇḍava	164	Prameyakamalānārtāṇḍa	228
Pradīpa	192	Prameyamālā	251
Pradyumnābhyudaya	166	Prameyaratnakośa	228
Pradyumnānanda	168	Prapancamithyātvaḥkhaṇḍana	245
Prahlādanadeva	166, 266	Prapancamithyātvaḥkhaṇḍa-	
Prajñāpāramita	224	napancikā	245
Prajñāparitrāṇa	251	Prapancasāra	247
Prājyabhaṭṭa	86, 174	Prapannapārijāta	251
Prakaranapancikā	241	Prāsādamāṇḍana	217

	PAGE		PAGE
Prasangaratnāvalī	107	Puṣpadūsitaka	164
Prasannarāghava	165, 264	Puṣpasūtra	31, 191
Prasastapāda	232	Pythagoras	204
Prasastapādabhāṣya	232, 234	Rādhākāntadeva	200
Praśnopaniṣad	28, 29	Rāgamālā	214
Praśnottararatnamālikā	247	Rāgamanjari	214
Praśnottaropāsakācāra	229	Rāgavibodha	215
Prasthānabheda	248	Rāghavanaiṣadhīya	88
Pratāparudradeva	208	Rāghavapāṇḍavayādaviya	87, 120
Pratāparudrīyakalyāṇa	166	Rāghavapāṇḍaviya	80, 83, 89, 199, 267
Pratāparudrīyayaśobhūṣaṇa	166, 187	Rāghavendrayati	245
Pratibhācāṇakya	163	Raghunandana	208, 233
Pratībhārendurāja	182	Raghunāthabhūpavijaya	87
Pratijñāyauḡandharāyaṇa	143	Raghunāthābhivudaya	87, 175
Pratimānāṭaka	142, 263	Raghunāthacarita	86, 117, 264
Pratimokṣasūtra	224	Raghunāthaśiromaṇi	233
Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya	225	Raghunāthavilāsa	167, 175
Praudhabrāhmaṇa	24	Raghuvamśa	61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 84, 263
Praudhadevarāya (Immaḍi)	213	Raghuvilāsamahākāvya	186
Praudhamanoramā	192	Raghuvīragadya	98
Pravarasena	75, 76, 89, 106, 111, 114, 263	Rahasyarakṣā	252
Prāyascittasūtra	34	Rājacūdāmaṇidīkṣita	87, 120, 167, 187, 240, 241, 264, 266
Premābhirāma	138	Rajamārtāṇḍa	236
Premavilāsa	255	Rājamitra	181
Priyadarśikā	110, 157, 158	Rājamrgāṅka	204
Prthuyaśas	203	Rajanātha II	86, 174
Prthvīrājaviḡaya	83, 174	Rajanātha III	86, 174
Punarvasu (Ātreya)	209, 210	Rājanighaṇṭu	212
Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala	214	Rājanītisamuccaya	102
Puṇyānanda	257	Rājaśekhara	77, 78, 82, 107, 116, 117, 119, 122, 138, 141, 145, 162, 163, 164, 168, 184, 188, 264, 265
Pūrṇabhadra	128	Rājaśekharasūri	175, 229
Pūrṇaprajña	244	Rājatarāṅgiṇī	82, 86, 174
Pūrṇasarasvatī	93	Rājavalīpatākā	86
Puruṣaparīkṣā	125	Rākṣasakāvya	94
Puruṣasūkta	9		
Puruṣottama	253		
Puruṣottamadeva	199		
Puṣpabāṇavilāsa	94		
Puṣpadanta	97		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Rāma	48, 168	Rāmāyaṇatattvadīpikā	48
Rāmabāṇastava	99	Rām Charit Manas	48
Rāmabhadradīkṣita	88, 99, 168, 264	Rāmila	110, 145
Rāmabhadrāmbā	87, 175	Rāṇaka	240, 241
Rāmabhadramuni	166	Rāṇakabhāvanākārikāvivarana	241
Rāmabhujangastotra	97	Rāṇakojjīvanī	240
Rāmābhyudaya	159, 170	Rangarāmānujamuni	251, 252
Rāmacandra	80, 86, 165, 192, 213, 266	Rasagangādhara	187, 193
Rāmacarita	80, 264	Rasakalikā	184
Rāmakaṇṭha	256	Rasamanjarī	186
Rāmakṛṣṇa	169	Rasaratnākara	212
Rāmalarahasya	203	Rasaratnasamuccaya	212
Rāmāmātya	214	Rasārṇava	218
Rāmānuja	60, 85, 87, 97, 98, 199, 249, 251, 252, 254	Rasārṇavasudhākara	186
Rāmānuja (Atreya)	251	Rasasadanabhāṇa	168
Rāmānujācārya	240, 241	Rasatarangiṇī	186
Rāmapālacarita	82, 174, 264	Rasavatī	196
Rāmapāṇivāda	197	Rasikaranjana	86
Rāmārāma	94	Raśmi	253
Rāmaśarman	181	Rāṣṭraudhavaṁśamahākāvya	86, 175
Rāmaśāstrin	93	Ratimanjarī	213
Rāmatarakavāgīśa	196, 197	Ratirahasya	213
Rāmatīrtha	245	Ratiratnapradīpikā	213
Rāmavarman	168	Ratnāharaṇa	181
Rāmavarmayaśobhūṣaṇa	187	Ratnākara	79, 89, 97, 163
Rāmāyaṇa	21, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 53, 56, 57, 64, 71, 76, 81, 88, 92, 120, 123, 131, 134, 142, 155, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 197, 210, 215, 243, 255, 261, 263, 264	Ratnakirti	226
Rāmāyaṇacampu	118, 119, 263, 264	Ratnaparīkṣā	217
Rāmāyaṇamanjarī	81, 264	Ratnatrayaparīkṣā	255
Rāmāyaṇatātparyasangraha	48, 255	Ratnāvalī	110, 138, 157, 158, 163, 164, 168
		Ratneśvaraprasādana	167
		Rāvaṇa	197
		Rāvaṇārjunīya	76
		Rāvaṇavadha	75, 76, 78, 263
		Ravidāsa	85
		Ravipati	138
		Raviṣeṇa	229
		Ravivarman	166

	PAGE		PAGE
R̥gbhāṣya	245	Śabdakaustubha	192
R̥gvedaprātisākhya	31	Śabdānuśāsana	195, 197
R̥gvedasamhitā	22	Śabdapradīpa	212
R̥gvidhāna	35	Śabdaprakāśikā	234
R̥juvimalapancikā	240	Śabdaratnākara	200
R̥kprātisākhya	198	Śabdārṇava	199
R̥ksamhitā	22, 36	Śabdaśaktiprakāśikā	234
Roger Abraham	7	Śabdavyāpāravicāra	185
Roth	7	Śabhāranjanaśataka	104
R̥ṣabha	227	Saccaritrarakṣā	251
R̥tusambhāra	75, 94	Sadānanda	248
Rucidatta	233	Sadāśiva	213, 216
Ruckert	95	Sadāśivamakhin	187
Rudra	117, 180	Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā	197
Rudrabhaṭṭa	128, 178, 184	Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya	228, 229, 258
Rudradāman	74, 110, 173	Saddharmapundarīka	224
Rudradāsa	168	Ṣaḍguruśiṣya	18
Rudrakavi	86, 175	Ṣaḍrāgacandrikā	214
Rudraṭa	184	Saduktikarṇāmṛta	103, 107
Rugviniścaya	211	Sadvidyāvijaya	252
Rukmiṇīharana	138, 165	Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇa	24, 25
Rukmiṇīkalāyāna	87	Sāhasāṅkacarita	83
Rukmiṇīpariṇaya	168	Sāhityacintāmaṇi	186
Rūpagosvāmin	93, 99, 108, 167, 187, 196, 254	Sāhityadarpaṇa	186
Rūpamālā	192	Sāhityamīmāṃsā	186
Rūpasiddhi	195	Sāhityaratnākara	87, 175
Rūpāvatāra	192	Sahr̥dayalīlā	186
Ruyyaka (Rucaka)	82, 185, 186	Sahr̥dayālokalocana	183
Śabarāsvāmin	193, 239, 241	Sahr̥dayānanda	83, 266
Śabdabhedaprakāśa	199	Sailālin	59
Śabdacandrikā	195, 200	Sakalakīrti	107, 229
Śabdakalpadruma	200	Śakaṭāyana	32, 195
		Śakavardhana	181

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Śāktānandatarangiṇī	257	Śāṇḍilya	250
Śaktibhadra	159, 263	Śāṇḍilyasūtra	250
Śaktisūtra	257	Sanghabhadra	223
Śaktivāda	234	Sangītacintāmaṇi	214
Śākuntala see Abhiññāna- śākuntala		Sangītaḍāmodara	215
Śālihotra	212	Sangītaḍarpaṇa	215
Śālikanātha	240	Sangītamakaranda	214
Śālivāhana	106	Sangītapārijāta	215
Śālivāhanakathā	125	Sangītarāja	214
Sāluvābhyudaya	86, 174	Sangītaratnākara	214
Samādhirāja	225	Sangītasamayāsāra	214
Samantabhadra	228	Sangītasāra	214
Sāmaprātiśākhyā	31	Sangītasārasangraha	215
Sāmarājadīkṣita	168	Sangītasudhā	215
Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra	217	Sangītasudhākara	214
Sāmavedasamhitā	23	Sangraha	191
Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa	25	Saṅkalpasūryodaya	169
Samayamātrkā	103	Saṅkara	54, 60, 95, 97, 102 103, 159, 169, 240, 243, 247, 248, 257, 258, 260
Sambandhaparīkṣā	226	Saṅkarabhaṭṭa	240
Śāmbhalīmata	103	Saṅkaramiśra	218, 233
Śāmbhavya	34	Saṅkarṣamuktāvalī	241
Śambhu	104, 108	Saṅkha	206
Samkṣepaśārīraka	248	Śaṅkhaḍharakavirāja	165
Samkṣiptasāra	196	Sāṅkhyakārikā	226, 235
Sammattitarkasūtra	228	Sāṅkhyaprapaśānanabhāṣya	235
Samsārāvarta	199	Sāṅkhyasāra	235
Samudramathana	138, 165	Sāṅkhyasūtra (Sāṅkhyaprapa- śānanasūtra)	235, 236
Sāmudrikātilaka	170	Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti	235
Samvitsiddhi	251	Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī	235
Sanaka	250	Śāṅkhyāyana	34
Sanātanagosvamin	254	Śāṅkhyāyanabrāhmaṇa	24
Sanatkumāravāstuśāstra	217	Śāṅkhyāyanasrautasūtra	198
Sandhyākaranandin	82, 174, 264		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Śanku	66, 67	Śārṅgadharasamhitā	212
Śankuka	173, 178, 179, 180, 183	Sarvadarśanasangraha	212, 256, 258
Ṣaṇmukhakalpa	217	Sarvajñamitra	96
Santānāntarasiddhi	226	Sarvajñanāīāyana	56
Śāntanavācārya	193	Sarvajñasiddhikārikā	226
Śantanu	193	Sarvajñātman	248
Śāntarakṣita	226, 258	Sarvamatasangraha	258
Śāntideva	102, 226	Sarvānanda	84
Śāntiśataka	103	Sarvānukramaṇī	35
Śāntivilāsa	104	Sarvārthasiddhi	251
Saptadaśabhūmiśāstrayogacaryā	225	Sarvavedāntasiddhāntasangraha	258
Saptapadārthī	232	Sarvavinodanāṭaka	169
Saptasandhānamalākāvya	88	Śaśivamśamahākāvya	81
Saptaśatī	106	Ṣaṣṭitantra	245
Śāradātanaya	137, 178, 186	Śāstradīpikā	240
Śāradātilaka	169	Śāśvata	199
Śāradvatīputraprakaraṇa	153	Śatadūṣaṇī	251, 252
Śaraṇa	95	Śātakarṇīharāṇa	110
Śaraṇadeva	192	Śatānanda	184, 204
Śaraṇāgatigadya	98	Śatapathabrāhmaṇa	24, 25, 26, 204
Sārasvataparakriyā	196	Śatasāhasrī	213
Sarasvatī	196	Śatasāhasrikāpāramita	225
Sarasvatīhrdayālankārahāra	214	Śataślokī	212
Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharāṇa	184, 192	Sātavāhana	67, 106, 111
Sarasvativilāsa	208	Sattasai	106
Śaravarman (Śarvavarman)	121, 195	Sāttvata	250
Śārīputraprakaraṇa	153	Satyahariścandra	165
Śārṅgadatta	26	Satyāśāḍha (Hiraṇyakesin)	23
Śārṅgadeva	214		34
Śārṅgadhara	107, 216, 218	Saugandhikāharāṇa	138, 166, 266
Śārṅgadharapaddhati	107		

	PAGE		PAGE
Saumilla	140, 141, 145	Śilparatna	217
Śaunaka	31, 34, 35	Simharāja	197
Saundarananda	69, 73, 153	Simhāsanadvātrimśatikā	125
Saundaryalaharī	97, 257	Siṅgabhūpāla	186, 187
Saupadmavyākaraṇa	196	Śiśupālavadha	78, 79, 265
Saurapurāṇa	62	Śiṣyadhīvrddhitāntra	202
Sauti	51, 52, 53	Śivabhujaṅgastotra	97
Sāyaṇa	17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 104, 107, 193, 241, 258	Śivadāsa	124, 125
Schiller	92	Śivadatta	108
Schlegel	7	Śivādityamiśra	233
Senaka	32	Śivadrṣṭi	257
Śeṣakṛṣṇa	120, 167	Śivadrṣṭyālocana	257
Śeṣanāga	197	Śivādvaitanirṇaya	255
Śeṣvaramīmamsā	251, 252	Śivalīlārṇava	87, 167
Setubandha	75, 76, 89, 180, 263	Śivānandalahari	97
Sevyasevakopadeśa	103	Śivanārāyaṇabhañjamahodaya	169
Siddhāñjana	233	Śivapurāṇa	59, 60, 62
Siddhāntabindu	248	Śivārkaṃanidīpikā	255
Siddhāntakaumudī	192, 193, 195, 241	Śivasūtra	256, 257
Siddhāntaleśasāngraha	248	Śivasūtravārtika	257
Siddhāntamuktāvali	234	Śivasvāmin	80, 89
Siddhāntaśiromaṇi	204	Śivotkarṣamanjarī	99
Siddharṣi	3, 129, 229	Skandapurāṇa	59, 60, 62
Siddhasenadivākara	96, 228	Skandasvāmin	18
Siddhitraya	251	Ślokaśāngraha	123
Siddhiyoga	211	Ślokavārtika	239, 240
Śikharāṇīmālā	255	Smṛticandrikā	208
Śikṣāsamuccaya	102, 226	Smṛtikalpataru	207
Śikṣāṣṭaka	254	Smṛtimuktāphala	208
Śilabhaṭṭārikā	112	Smṛtiratnākara	208
Silhaṇa	103	Smṛtiśāngraha	208
		Soḍḍhala	113, 119

	PAGE		PAGE
Somadeva	119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 165, 195, 216	Śrīnivāsadīkṣita	87, 167, 170, 266
Somānanda	257	Śrīnivāsātīrtha	245
Somanātha	215, 240	Śrīpūrṇa	251
Somapālavilāsa	82, 174	Śrīrāma	48
Somaprabha	103	Śrīrangagadya	98
Someśvara	113, 107, 214, 217, 240, 241	Śrīrangarājastava	98
Someśvaradeva	84, 119	Śrīstava	98
Somila	110, 145, 156	Śrīvara	86, 107, 125, 174
Spandakārikā	257	Śrīvatsāṅka	98, 251
Spandanirṇaya	257	Śrīvīrakavi	125
Spandapradīpikā	257	Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇabāṇa	138, 167
Spandasarvasva	257	Śṛṅgāramanjarī	168
Sphoṭavāda	193, 194	Śṛṅgāraprakāśa	116, 184, 185
Sphoṭasiddhi	194, 247	Śṛṅgārasarvasva	168
Sphoṭāyana	194	Śṛṅgārasarvasvabhāṇa	167
Sphurjīdhvaja	202	Śṛṅgāraśataka	95, 102
Sragdharāstotra	96	Śṛṅgārasudhākara	168
Śrībhāṣya	251, 252	Śṛṅgāratilaka	94, 168, 184
Śrīcihṇakāvya	81, 197	Śṛṅgāravairāgyatarangiṇī	103
Śrīdāmacarita	168	Śrutabodha	198
Śrīdhara	204, 229, 232, 254	Śrutapradīpikā	251
Śrīdharadāsa	107	Śrutaparakāśikā	251, 252
Śrīguṇaratnakosa	98	Śrutiparīkṣā	226
Śrīharsa	83, 89, 248, 266	Sthavirāvalicarita	229
Śrījayagopāla	253	Sthirasiddhadūṣaṇa	226
Śrīkaṇṭha	255, 256	Stotraratna	98, 251
Śrīkaṇṭhacarita	82, 89, 174, 188, 199	Stotrāvali	97
Śrīkumāra	217	Subandhu	54, 83, 114, 116, 117, 122, 123
Śrīnivāsa	253	Subhacandra	229
Śrīnivāsacampu	120	Subhadrādhanaajya	162, 167, 265, 267
Śrīnivāsācārya	252, 258		

	PAGE		PAGE
Subhadrāhrraṇa	169, 267	Sumanottarā	110
Subhadrāpariṇaya	168, 170, 267	Sumantu	51
Subhaṅkara	215	Sundarabāhustava	98
Subhāṣitahārāvali	108	Sundarapāṇḍya	102
Subhāṣitakaustubha	104	Sundarī	168
Subhāṣitanīvi	104	Suuyasaptati	225
Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra	108	Supadmapanjikā	196
Subhāṣitaratnasandoha	103	Suprabhātastotra	96
Subhāṣitasudhānidhi	107	Sūra Arya	124, 284
Subhāṣitāvali	107, 108	Surapāla	212
Subhaṭa	170	Surathotsava	84, 119, 174
Subodhinī	240, 253	Surāśvara	212, 240, 247
Subrahmaṇya	160	Sūryaśataka	96
Subuddhimanoharā	233	Suśruta	211, 218
Sucaritamīśra	240	Suśrutasamhitā	211, 218
Sudarśanasūri	251, 252	Sūtasamhitā	62
Sudhālaharī	99	Sūtrālaṅkāra	124, 224
Śūdraka	114, 134, 135, 136, 144, 151, 152, 153	Sūtrasamuccaya	102, 226
Śūdrakakathā	110, 145	Suvarṇaprabhāsa	225
Suhrillekha	225	Suvṛttatilaka	92, 161, 198
Śuka	51, 174	Svalpavivāhaphala	203
Śukapakṣīya	251	Svapnacintamaṇi	203
Śukasaptati	125, 128	Svapnadaśānana	163
Sukhānanda	212	Svapnanāṭika	140, 143
Sukhāvativyūha	225	Svapnavāsavadatta	140, 141 143, 164
Sukhopajīvanī	241	Svaramelakalānidhi	214
Śukranītisāra	216	Svarūpasambodhana	228
Sukṛtasankīrtana	84, 174	Svātmārāmayogīndra	237
Sūktānukramaṇi	35	Svetāśvataropanīṣad	28, 29
Sūktimuktāvalī	107, 112	Syādvādakalikā	229
Sūktivāridhi	108	Syādvādamanjarī	229
Sukumārakavi	86	Syādvādaratnākara	228
		Syāmalādaṇḍaka	96

	PAGE		PAGE
Syāmasāstrin	100	Tarkāmṛta	234
Syāmilaka	156	Tarkanyāya	226
Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa	24, 25, 26	Tarkasangraha	234
Taittirīyaprātisākhyasūtra	31	Tarkasangrahadīpikā	234
Taittirīyarāṇyaka	25	Tarkaśāstra	226
Taittirīyasamhitā	23, 24, 25, 28	Tārkikarakṣā	233
Taittirīyasamhitābhāṣya	17	Tathāgataguhyaka	225
Taittirīyopanisad	28, 29, 253	Tātparyacandikā	245, 252
Tājika	203	Tātparyadīpikā	62, 240, 251
Tāādhyāya	214	Tātparyapariśuddhi	232
Talavakārabrāhmaṇa	25	Tattva	208
Taṇḍālakṣaṇasūtra	34	Tattvabindu	240
Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa	24, 34	Tattvabodhinī	193
Tanka	243, 250	Tattvacintāmaṇi	233
Tantradīpikā	245	Tattvacintāmaṇiprakāśa	233
Tantrākhyāyikā	128	Tattvacintāmaṇiprakāśa-	
Tantrāloka	257	makaranda	233
Tantrarahasya	241	Tattvacintāmaṇyāloka	233
Tantrarāja	257	Tattvadīpikā	245, 248
Tantraratna	240	Tattvakaustubha	248
Tantrasāra	240, 257	Tattvamuktākālāpa	251
Tantrasiddhānta	241	Tattvanirṇaya	251
Tantrasiddhāntadīpikā	241	Tattvaprakāśa	256
Tantrasīkhāmaṇi	241	Tattvaprakāśikā	245, 253
Tantravārtika	239, 240	Tattvaratnākara	251
Tāpasavatsarāja	162	Tattvārthādhīgamasūtra	228
Tapatīsamvaraṇa	162	Tattvārthasāradīpikā	229
Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati	200	Tattvārthavārtikavyākhyā-	
Tarangadatta	164	nālankāra	228
Tarangavatī	110, 117	Tattvasamāsa	235
Taranginī	245	Tattvasamīkṣā	248
Tarkabhāṣā	229, 233	Tattvasaṅkhyāna	245
Tarkakaumudī	243, 241	Tattvasangraha	226, 258

	PAGE		PAGE
Tattvasangrahanpanjikā	226	Udbhaṭa	177, 180, 182
Tattvasāra	251	Udbhaṭālaṅkāra	182
Tattvasiddhāntavyākhyā	255	Uddandakavi	85, 93, 167
Tattvavaiśārādī	236	Uddhavasandēśa	93
Tattvaṭīkā	251, 252	Uddyota	192
Tattvaviveka	245	Uddyotakara	116, 231, 232
Tattvoddyota	245	Uddyotana	192
Tattvoktikośa	184	Ugrabhūti	196
Tilaka	48	Ujjvalanīlamanī	187
Tilakamanjarī	117, 123, 217	Umāpatidhara	95
Tirumalāmbā	119, 175	Umāsvāti	228
Tithinirṇaya	208	Umveka	159, 240
Tisāṭa	212	Unādisūtra	190, 193
Trikālaparīkṣā	226	Unmādavāsavadatta	159
Trikāṇḍaśeṣa	199	Unmattarāghava	138, 166, 167, 264
Tripādanītinayana	239	Upadeśasāhasrī	247
Tripuradāha	165	Upadeśaśataka	104
Tripuravijaya	138	Upagranthasūtra	34
Trisāti	204	Upakramaparākrama	241
Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita	82, 129	Upamitibhāvaprapancakathā	3, 129, 229
Trivikrama	197	Upaṇiṣadbhāṣya	248
Trivikramabhaṭṭa	113, 118, 122, 266	Upaṇiṣadbrāhmaṇa	25
Tryambakamakhin	48	Upaskāra	233
Tulsidas	48	Upavanavinoda	218
Ṭuptīkā	239, 240	Upavarṣa	188, 239, 243, 250
Tyāgarāja	100	Úrubhanga	143, 265
Ubhayābhisārikā	154	Uśanas	206, 215
Udāttarāghava	162	Utpaladeva	97, 257
Udaya	18	Utpalinī	199
Udayana	231, 232, 233, 234, 260	Utpreksāvallabha	86
Udayasundarīkathā	119	Uttaracampu	120, 264
		Uttarapurāṇa	118, 229

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Uttararāmacarita	133, 134, 137, 138, 155, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 264	Vaitānaśrautasūtra	34
Uvata	18	Vaitānasūtra	34
Vācaspati	199, 208	Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra	193
Vācaspatimiśra	85, 231, 232, 235, 236, 240, 247, 248	Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana	192
Vācaspatya	200	Vaiyāsikyanyāyamālā	248
Vādakuśala	226	Vājasaneyīprātiśākhyasūtra	31, 191
Vādamārga	226	Vājasaneyīsamhitā	22, 24, 28, 35
Vādanakṣatramālā	241	Vākpati	79, 116, 118, 141, 159, 173
Vādāvali	245	Vakroktijīvita	183
Vādavidhi	226	Vakroktipancāśikā	97
Vādībhasimha	117	Vākya	243
Vādirāja	245	Vākyapadīya	191, 194
Vāgbhaṭa	82, 186, 210, 211, 212, 218	Vālakhilya	22
Vāgbhaṭālankāra	186	Vallabha	232
Vāgvallabha	198	Vallabhācārya	253
Vaidyajīvana	212	Vallabhadeva	104, 108, 124
Vaidyanātha	193, 207	Vālmīki	6, 21, 23, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 52, 53, 56, 57, 63, 64, 91, 114, 118, 163, 164, 197, 263
Vaidyanāthadīkṣita	48, 208	Vālmīkibhāṣya	48
Vaijayantī	199, 254	Vālmīkisūtra	197
Vaikunṭhagadya	98	Vāmana	95, 152, 158, 176, 177, 180, 181, 184, 191, 216
Vaikunṭhastava	98	Vāmanabhāṭṭabāṇa	86, 93, 117, 138, 167, 175, 187, 200, 264, 266
Vaipulyasūtra	224	Vāmanapurāṇa	59, 60, 61
Vairāgyapancaka	104	Vaṁśabrāhmaṇa	25
Vairāgyaśataka	102, 103, 104	Vangasena	212
Vaiśampāyana	50, 51, 53	Vāñībhūṣaṇa	198
Vaiśeṣikasūtra	218, 231, 232, 234		
Vaiṣṇavatoṣaṇī	254		

	PAGE.		PAGE
Varadābhyudaya	120	Vasugupta	256
Varadācārya	168, 251, 252	Vatsabhaṭṭi	66, 69, 75
Varadāmbikāpariṇayacampu	119, 175	Vtsaraāja	138, 165, 266
Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka	251	Vātsyāyana	75, 88, 157, 212, 213, 232
Varadarāja	193, 208, 233	Vāyupurāṇa	59, 62
Varadarājastava	98, 99	Vedabhāṣyabhūmikāsangraha	261
Varāhamihira	66, 67, 198, 201, 202, 203, 217	Vedakavi	170
Varāhapurāṇa	59, 60, 61	Vedāngarāya	200, 204
Vararuci	1, 65, 67, 110, 116, 122, 125, 154, 182, 188, 191, 193, 196, 197	Vedāntadeśika	85, 93, 98, 104, 169, 249, 251, 252
Vararucikāvya	191	Vedāntādhikaraṇamālā	253
Vararucisangraha	191	Vedāntadīpa	251
Vardhamāna	212, 226, 233	Vedāntaparibhāṣā	248
Varivasyāprakāśa	257	Vedāntapārijātasaurabha	253
Varṣa	190	Vedāntasāra	248, 251
Vārṣagaṇya	235	Vedāntasūtra	242
Vārtika	191	Vedārthaparakāśa	18
Vārtikābharāṇa	240	Vedārthasangraha	249, 251
Vasantatilakabhāṇa	168	Vemabhūpāla	186, 214
Vasantavilāsa	84, 174	Vemabhūpālacarita	117, 175
Vāsavadattā	110, 111, 116	Veṇīsamhāra	133, 134, 137, 138, 158, 265
Vasiṣṭha	18, 31, 70, 202	Venkaṭādhvarin	80, 87, 89, 99, 104, 118, 120, 168, 241, 264
Vāsiṣṭhadharmasūtra	206	Veṇkaṭamādhava	18
Vāstumandana	217	Venkaṭamakhin (Venkateśvara- ramakhin, Venkaṭadīkṣita)	87, 215, 240
Vasubandhu	225, 226	Veṇkaṭanātha	85
Vāsudeva	84, 85, 89, 93, 266	Venkaṭarāma Sarma	85
Vāsudevādhvarin (dīkṣita)	193, 241	Vetālabhaṭṭa	66, 67
Vāsudevaratha	119, 175		
Vāsudevasārvabhauma	233		

	PAGE		PAGE
Vetālapancavimśatikā	124, 125, 128	Vimalasarasvatī	192
Vibhramaviveka	247	Vimuktātman	248
Vidagdhamādhava	167	Vīṇāvāsa vadatta	154
Vidagdhamukhamandana	188	Vinayapiṭaka	224
Viddhasālabhanjikā	163, 164, 168	Vinayaprabhā	94
Vidhirasāyana	241	Vindhyāvāsa	235
Vidhitrayaparitrāṇa	241	Viniyogasangraha	34
Vidhiviveka	240	Vīrabhadra	213
Vidvajjanavallabha	203	Vīracarita	125
Vidyādhara	187	Vīracintāmaṇi	216
Vidyāmādhavīya	202	Vīrakamparāyacarita	85
Vidyānātha	166, 187	Vīramitrodaya	120, 208
Vidyāpariṇaya	170	Vīranandin	84
Vidyāpati	125	Vīranārāyaṇacarita	117
Vidyāraṇya	166, 214, 217, 248	Vīrasena	74
Vigraharājadeva Viśāladeva	165	Vīravijaya	169
Vigrahavyāvartanī	225	Vīreśvara	105
Vijayā	114	Virūpākṣa	167, 264
Vijayaśrī	166	Viśākhadatta (Viśākhadeva)	134, 135, 155, 156
Vijayīndra	245	Viśālākṣa	215
Vijñānabhikṣu	235, 236, 248	Viṣamabāṇalīlā	182
Vijñānāmṛta	248	Viṣayavākya-dīpikā	252
Vijnāneśvara	207	Viṣṇudāsa	94
Vikhanas	206, 250	Viṣṇudharmasūtra	206
Vikrama	93	Viṣṇudharmottara	62, 217
Vikramāditya	199, 216	Viṣṇugupta	215, 216
Vikramāṅkadevacarita	81, 95, 173	Viṣṇulaharī	99
Vikramārkacarita	125	Viṣṇupādādikeśāntavarṇana	97
Vikramodaya	125	Viṣṇupurāṇa	58, 59, 60, 61, 143
Vikramorvaśīya	68, 70, 133, 134, 137, 145, 146, 148, 149, 160, 164, 167, 179.	Viṣṇusahasranāma	251, 253
		Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya	247
		Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya	245

	PAGE		PAGE
Viṣṇutrātā	93	Vyakirtiveka	184, 186
Viśvagunādarśa	118, 120, 168, 241	Vyāpticarcā	226
Viśvāmitra	18, 216	Vyāsa	21, 31, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 114, 118, 230, 236, 242
Viśvanātha	138, 166, 168, 186, 266	Vyāsagītā	62
Viśvanāthanyāyapancānana	234	Vyāsaśikṣā	31
Viśvaparakāśa	199	Vyāsaśrīrāmadeva	170
Viśvarūpa	207, 240	Vyāsayati	245, 248
Viśveśvara	168, 186, 187, 208	Vyavahāranirṇaya	208
Viśveśvarasūri (Gāgābhaṭṭa)	241	Vyomaśekhara	232
Vītarāgastuti	228, 229	Vyomavatī	232
Viṭṭhalanāthaji	253	Vyutpattivāda	234
Vivarana	239, 240	Wackernāgel	7
Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha	248	Weber	7, 43, 44, 45, 53, 113
Vivekacūḍāmaṇi	247	Wheeler Talboys	44
Vopadeva	61, 212	Wilkins Charles	7
Vṛddhabharata	213	Winternitz	46
Vṛddhacāṇakya-	102	Yādavābhyudaya	85
Vṛddhagarga	201	Yādavaprakāśa	199, 244, 251, 254
Vṛddhagārgīsaṁhitā	201	Yādavarāghaviya	87
Vṛddhajīvaka	211	Yajñanārāyaṇadīkṣita	87, 167, 175, 187
Vṛddhajīvakīyā	211	Yajñaphala	144, 263
Vṛddhavāsīṣṭhasaṁhitā	202	Yājñavalkya	24, 31, 70, 215
Vṛddhayavanajātaka	203	Yājñavalkyasmṛti	190, 207
Vṛkṣāyurveda	212, 218	Yājñikopaniṣad	28
Vṛnda	211	Yajurvedānukramaṇi	35
Vṛndamādhava	211	Yajurvedasaṁhitā	26
Vṛṣabhānuja	169	Yamalāṣṭakatantra	214
Vṛttaratnākara	198	Yāmuna	97, 251, 252
Vṛttaratnāvali	198	Yaśaścandra	165, 174
Vṛtti	239, 243, 250		
Vṛttivārtika	187		
Vyāḍi	190, 191, 199		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Yaśahphala	169	Yogamanjarī	212
Yaśastilakacampu	119, 123, 216	Yogarahasya	251
Yāska	18, 32, 207	Yogasāra	211
Yaśodhara	213	Yogasārasangraha	236
Yaśodharacarita	80, 173	Yogaśāstra	103, 211
Yaśovarman	159	Yogasūtra	236
Yaśovijayagaṇi	229	Yogasūtrabhāṣya	236
Yatidharmasamuccaya	254	Yogavāsiṣṭha	62
Yatīndramatadīpikā	252	Yogayātrā	203
Yavanajātaka	202, 203	Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya	84, 85, 266
Yavaneśvara	202	Yuktikalpataru	216
Yogabindu	228	Yuktiśiṣṭikā	225
Yogācārabhūmisūtra	225	Zend Avesta	11, 20

